A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A Popiſh Prieſt AND An Engliſh Proteſtant.

WHEREIN

The Principal Points and Arguments of both RELIGIONS are truly Propoſed and fully Examined.

By MATTHEW POOLE

Miniſter of the Goſpel.

The Laſt Edition corrected and amended.

LONDON:

Printed by *E. Cotes*, and are to be ſold by *R. Smith* in the firſt Court in *Greſham* Colledge next *Biſhopſgate-ſtreet*, *S. Tomſon* at the Biſhops-head in *Duck-lane*, *F. Titan* at the Three-Daggers in *Fleet-Street*, and *H. Mortlock* at the White-heart in *Weſtminſter-Hall*, 1667.

Imprimatur,

Tho. Tomkyns, R. in Christo P. a Dno. Dno. Gilb. Archiep. Cant. à Sac. Domest.

Ex. Æd. Lamb.
Jan. 23. 1666.

A

DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

A Popiſh Prieſt

AND

An Engliſh Proteſtant.

WHEREIN

The Principal Points and Arguments of both RELIGIONS are truly Propoſed and fully Examined.

By MATTHEW POOLE

Miniſter of the Goſpel.

The Laſt Edition corrected and amended.

LONDON:

Printed by *E. Cotes*, and are to be ſold by *R. Smith* in the firſt Court in *Greſham* Colledge next *Biſhopſgate-ſtreet*, *S. Tomſon* at the Biſhops-head in *Duck-lane*, *F. Titan* at the Three-Daggers in *Fleet-Street*, and *H. Mortlock* at the White-heart in *Weſtminſter-Hall*, 1667.

TO THE READER.

THE *variety and differences of Religion, between Protestant and Papist, distract the minds and trouble the hearts of all that have any sense of Religious Concernments. In this distraction every serious man that hath any care of his Souls health, cannot choose but heartily desire and seek for resolution: To obtain this, there can be no better way than to understand and examine the Pretensions and Grounds of both Religions: In order to this, I have endeavoured faithfully to represent, and duly to weigh them in the following Discourse.*

Wherein though I have not dis-
cuſſed all the Points in Controverſie
between us and them, yet I have ſe-
lected the moſt material, and have
diſcourſed of moſt, if not all, their
weighty and plauſible Arguments a
gainſt the Proteſtant Religion. An
this, I may ſay, and no knowing Papiſt
I think, will deny it; all the other
Points will follow the fate of thoſe
which are here examined, and live
or dye with them. I know it will be
pretended, that I have managed the
Work with partiality and deceit, and
that I make the Papiſt ſpeak what I
pleaſe, not what they think. This
muſt be ſaid of courſe, elſe the Ro-
maniſts, *loſe their old wont: Nor ſhall*
I at all think it ſtrange, if in ſtead
of ſolid Anſwers, they return Calum-
nies: their cauſe requires it; and no
wonder if they that want Truth in
their Religion, make lies their Re-
fuge.

To silence all clamours, and satisfie all jealousies will be impossible, I shall never attempt it.

But for satisfaction of such as are rational and ingenuous, I shall give this following account.

1. God is my witness, that I did diligently endeavour to pick out the strongest Arguments I could find in their best Authors in each Point, nor have I willingly declined any thing of moment in the Questions here debated: If any Papist think otherwise, let him produce their greater strength, and I hope he shall finde it fairly examined.

2. The several Discourses, Arguments and Answers which I put into the Papists mouth, are such as were first taken out of their mouths, and so it is but a piece of Justice and Restitution to return them thither. They are generally such as are either known to be their

NOTE

This volum
tight binding a
effort has beer
duce the centre
result in

acat
microforr

ne has a very
and while every
en made to repro-
res, force would
in damage

demic
rms

Wherein though I have not dis-
cussed all the Points in Controversie
between us and them, yet I have se-
lected the most material, and have
discoursed of most, if not all, their
weighty and plausible Arguments
gainst the Protestant Religion. And
this, I may say, and no knowing Papist
I think, will deny it; all the other
Points will follow the fate of those
which are here examined, and live
or dye with them. I know it will be
pretended, that I have managed the
Work with partiality and deceit, and
that I make the Papist speak what I
please, not what they think. This
must be said of course, else the Ro-
manists, *lose their old wont: Nor shall*
I at all think it strange, if in stead
of solid Answers, they return Calum-
nies: their cause requires it; and no
wonder if they that want Truth in
their Religion, make lies their Re-
fuge.

To silence all clamours, and satisfie all jealousies will be impossible, I shall never attempt it.

But for satisfaction of such as are rational and ingenuous, I shall give this following account.

1. God is my witness, that I did diligently endeavour to pick out the strongest Arguments I could find in their best Authors in each Point, nor have I willingly declined any thing of moment in the Questions here debated: If any Papist think otherwise, let him produce their greater strength, and I hope he shall finde it fairly examined.

2. The several Discourses, Arguments and Answers which I put into the Papists mouth, are such as were first taken out of their mouths, and so it is but a piece of Justice and Restitution to return them thither. They are generally such as are either known to be their

their opinions, and by themselves own
ed, or else delivered in the sense, an
very oft in the words, of their most ap
proved Authors, whom I have quote
in the margent: But here I expect th
old clamour of false Quotations, wher
in they have been so often take
tardy, that they must now look for th
common infelicity of —— not to be be
lieved if they should chance to stumbl
upon Truth. All the relief I desire i
that case is, that the Reader who i
able to do it, would examine them wit
his own eyes, and that will be my be
justification. I shall detain thee n
longer, but commend thee to the goo
Spirit of Truth to enable thee to dis
cern between good and evil.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE Romiſh Church.

THE Controverſies between your Church and ours are by Gods bleſſing upon the endeavours of his Miniſters, brought to this paſs, that I am perſwaded there is nothing wanting to the Conviction of divers of you, but a free and diligent peruſal of their Books, without prejudice and partiality: This your Prieſts knowing, it is their great deſign to keep you from looking into them; and to that end, to poſſeſs you with this Principle, That you need not trouble your ſelves to inquire into Books, you are ſafe enough, ſo long as you believe as the

their opinions, and by themselves own
ed, or else delivered in the sense, an
very oft in the words, of their most ap
proved Authors, whom I have quote
in the margent: But here I expect th
old clamour of false Quotations, wher
in they have been so often take
tardy, that they must now look for th
common infelicity of —— not to be be
lieved if they should chance to stumbl
upon Truth. All the relief I desire i
that case is, that the Reader who i
able to do it, would examine them wit
his own eyes, and that will be my be
justification. I shall detain thee n
longer, but commend thee to the goo
Spirit of Truth to enable thee to dis
cern between good and evil.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE Romiſh Church.

THE Controverſies between your Church and ours are by Gods bleſſing upon the endeavours of his Miniſters, brought to this paſs, that I am perſwaded there is nothing wanting to the Conviction of divers of you, but a free and diligent peruſal of their Books, without prejudice and partiality: This your Prieſts knowing, it is their great deſign to keep you from looking into them; and to that end, to poſſeſs you with this Principle, That you need not trouble your ſelves to inquire into Books, you are ſafe enough, ſo long as you believe as the

Church believes, and follow the Guidance of your Prieſts and Fathers: *If this be an Error, it is a dangerous one, and may prove Damnable; That it is ſo, and that it will prove but a broken reed, when you lean upon it, I hope you will ſee there is reaſon to believe, if you will but do your ſouls that juſtice, not prodigally to caſt them away upon blind and wilful miſtakes, and take the pains to read theſe enſuing lines.*

1. *If your Church be not Infallible, then this Principle is rotten; howſoever, you cannot with ſafety or diſcretion venture your ſouls on it, till you have examined at leaſt this one point of the Churches Infallibillity: do but examine that, and if you do not ſtifle both Reaſon and Conſcience, you will ſee it is a meer cheat.*

2. *If the Church* (that is, *a Pope with a Council*) *were infallible* (*which is all that your great Champions plead for*) *yet all confeſs, that your particular Prieſts* (*upon whoſe conduct you hazard your eternal well-fare*) *are fallible and ſubject to miſtakes. It is moſt certain that divers of your Prieſts and*

and Confessors lead you into many (and some of them damnable) Errours. Thousands of your Priests and learned Doctors do charge the Jesuits with poysoning the souls of the people with divers pestilent and damnable errours, such as these: That a man may venture his soul upon any probable opinion, and that is probable, which but one of their learned Doctors affirm. That a private man may kil his enemy to maintain his honor, though not by way of revenge. That a Priest may absolve even old and inveterate sinners, and such as he believes incorrigible. That affliction or sorrow for sin, arising meerly from fear of punishments, is sufficient for salvation; and, that the affection of loving God is not absolutely necessary to salvation. *All these and many more are clearly proved out of their own words and writings in the Provincial letters, otherwise called, the Mystery of Jesuitisme : See the Latine edition set forth and defended by* Wendrockius. *Now if the Jesuits may, and do, so damnably deceive those thousands of you that depend upon their counsel and conduct, why may not other Orders deceive you in other things ? Or what is there that can give you any reasonable security ? Is it their learn-*

ing, prudence, pretended devotion, or honesty, o
any other such like quality? Why, divers o
the Jesuits have given as plausible testi
mony of these things (so far as men can judge,
as most of the other Orders; or will you say
all other Orders are infallible, the Jesuits only
excepted?

3. *Nothing can be more evident (if the Bible be the word of God) than that the error or misguidance of the Priest, will not excuse the sin of the people. To satisfie you in this, I beseech you consider these few reasons.*

1. *The Scripture condemns, and God severely punished those people, which did follow the errours of their Priests. This did not excuse the* Jews *in* Aarons *time, that they were misled by* Aaron, Exod. 32. *nor those in the times of the wicked Kings of* Israel *and* Judah, *that their Priests did universally deceive them, and poor* Elijah, *and so* Michaiah, *were left alone; nor those in* Malachy's *daies, that* the Priests caused them to stumble at the Law, Malac. 2. 8. *nor the Crucifiers of Christ, that they obeyed the decrees of their Priests and Rulers.*

I list not to repeat what I have said elsewhere: therefore read Nullity of Romish Faith, ch. 2. sect 12. *And will you yet stumble at the same stone!*

2. *The*

2. *The People will not be excuſed by their Prieſts miſguidance, becauſe they neglect their duty. If indeed there were no duty incumbent upon the people but to believe what your Prieſts ſay, and do what they require, then your Church ſpeaks reaſon. But that none but a mad man will ſay.*

There are ſeveral duties required of the People, no leſs than of the Prieſts; the law of God was not given only to the Prieſts, but to all the People; God publiſheth this law in the hearing of all the people, and ſpeaks in the ſingular number to every one of the people, thou ſhalt do or forbear *this or that; and the curſe is threatned to the people,* Deut. 27. 26. Curſed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them, and all the people ſhall ſay *Amen. Which the Apoſtle repeats,* Gal. 3. 10. Curſed is every one, *not Prieſts only, but the People too,* that continueth not in all things which are written in this book of the law to do them. *If the Prieſts* then *ſhould have taught the Iſraelites (as your Prieſts* now *teach you)* thou ſhalt worſhip a graven image, *when God ſaith,* thou ſhalt not worſhip a graven image: *can any ſerious man think this would have freed them from*

that curſe; and that it was ſafer for them to obey the command of men than of God? O the impudence of your Prieſts that dare ſay ſo! O the blockiſhneſs of thoſe people that will believe them when they ſay ſo! your Pope *may well contend with us, for it ſeems your* Prieſts *will conteſt with* God *for* Supremacy: *When the Prieſts and Prophets in* Iſaiahs *daies were generally corrupt, the people are not adviſed to believe all that they taught, and to obey all that they decreed (which is the ſtrain of your Church) but are commanded immediately to go* to the law and to the teſtimony, *and* if any ſpeak not according to them, *they are to be rejected,* becauſe there is no light in them, *Iſa.* 8. 20. *Even people are required* not to believe every ſpirit, *but* to try the ſpirits, 1 John 4. 1. *Nor did the Apoſtles exempt themſelves and their doctrines from this* Tryal, *but allowed, commended, and required it in the people.*

The Beræans *are not reproved and cenſured (as they would certainly be that ſhould tread in their ſteps at* Rome) *but commended for examining the Doctrine of S.* Paul *by the Scripture,* Acts 17. 11. *And the ſame Apoſtle allows the* Galatians, *not only to try his Doctrines, whether they were agreeable*

to

to what they had received; but in caſe they find them contrary, he gives them Commiſſion to cenſure and anathematize him, Gal. 1. 8, 9. *And he beſpeaks the* Corinthians *in this language*, I ſpeak to wiſe men, judge you what I ſay, 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. *And he commands the* Theſſalonians *to* prove all things *(without exception) as well as to* hold faſt that which is good, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 21. *Conſider theſe things, I beſeech you, and do not wilfully caſt away your precious ſouls upon trifles. God hath given the Scripture as a rule to try things by (and this was written for the Ignorant, and the people, as well as the learned, and the Prieſts,* John 20. 31.) *he hath given people reaſon to try things with, if you will hide theſe Talents in a Napkin, at your peril be it. The Prince was commanded to* read and meditate in the Book of the Law, that he might obſerve to do all that is written therein, *Joſh.* 1. 8. *Can you ſeriouſly think that if the corrupt Prieſts had agreed to teach him to do contrary to all that was written therein, that this would have excuſed him before God? then that Precept was both ſuperfluous and dangerous; and if you do not think ſo, (as you muſt needs if you have*

any

any Conſcience) *then neither will it excuſe your people*; *for according to the Doctrine of your Church, Prince and People are alike in this, both tied to believe as your Church believes. God commands every Chriſtian to* prove his own work; *and tells us, that* every man ſhall bear his own *burden*, Gal. 6. 4, 5. *and, that* every man ſhall give an account of himſelf to God, *Rom.* 14. 12. (*Do not think your Prieſts account ſhall ſerve turn*) *and all the Chriſtian people of* Corinth *are commanded to* examine themſelves whether they be in the faith, 2 Cor. 13. 5. *And dare you ſtill live in the wilful breach of all theſe Commands, and blindly give up your Souls and Conſciences by an implicite faith, to the conduct of your Prieſts to lead them whether they pleaſe?*

3. *The Scripture hath given you full warning of your danger. Read but two places,* Ezek. 33. 8. (*where God aſſures us, that the* wicked ſhall dye in his iniquity, *though he periſhed through the Watchmans fault*) *and* Matth. 15. 14. (*where Chriſt confutes this very opinion of yours, which was alſo the opinion of the* Jews, *that they were ſafe enough while they followed*

lowed their Priests Decrees and Counsels; and tells them, If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the Ditch) *and doubt of this if you can or dare.*

In a word, if this senceless Doctrine were true, not onely Men would have dominion over our Faith, contrary to expres Scripture; (Be not ye called Masters, for one is your Master, even Christ, *Matth.* 23. 10. Not that we have dominion over your faith, *said the great Apostle*) *but also Christ should lose his dominion, and have no authority in his Church, but as your Priests please; and it seems he shall not have this favour from you, to continue in his Office* quamdiu bene se gesserit, *but* quamdiu vobis placuerit; *and Christs power is apparently limited to your Interpretation; but the power of your Church is absolute and unlimited, and the People obliged to believe them,* quamcunque sententiam tulerint, *whatsoever they shall decree, as* Gretser *expresseth it. If this be not to make the Word and Authority of God and Christ void, through your Traditions, I know not what is. I will trouble you no further: If you be capable of Counsel, take warning, and suffer not your selves to be lead hoodwinckt to*

Hell,

Hell, to ſerve a Carnal Intereſt of ſome a
mong you; but quit your ſelves like men
and by the groſſneſs of this deluſion, learn
to ſuſpect the reſt; and with humble an
honeſt hearts, read what is here propoſed t
you for your Souls good, and God give yo
light. Let my Soul proſper no other wiſ
than I heartily wiſh the good and ſalva
tion of you all; but if you will ſtill perſiſ
in your blindneſs, and add further obſti
nacy to your Errors, I ſhall comfort m
ſelf in this, that I have delivered my own
ſoul, your blood be upon your own head, fo
there it will aſſuredly fall, and not upo
the Prieſts only.

Vide Domos.

Mr. POOLE's Dialogue.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A Popiſh Prieſt AND An Engliſh Proteſtant.

Pop. *DEar Friend I am glad to meet with you after ſo long a ſeparation; for I remember we were brought up at the ſame School, and I rejoyce in the opportunity of renewing our acquaintance, I deſire a little diſcourſe with you, to underſtand how it is with you in point of Religion.*

Prot. I am of the Proteſtant reformed Religion.

Pop. *I am heartily ſorry for it in regard of our old intimacy; but if you will give me leave, I do not queſtion, but in a very little*

time to give you ſuch reaſons as will force you to leave thoſe damnable Errors, and to return to your antient Mother the Church of Rome.

Prot. With a very good will ſhall I yield my ſelf to your Inſtruction, I deſire nothing more than true Information; I know I have a Soul to ſave, which is of infinite worth, and I am not fond of damnation; therefore if you give me better grounds than I have, you ſhall not finde me obſtinate: but this I muſt tell you, you muſt not put me off with fancies and bare affirmations; but I ſhall expect ſolid proof of what you ſay from Scripture or Reaſon, and now ſpeak what you pleaſe.

Pop. *Firſt, my dear Friend, I muſt intreat you to conſider that which your own Miniſters teach you, to wit, That there is no Salvation to be had out of the true Catholick Church, which is the Church of* Rome.

Prot. That none is ſaved out of the true Catholick Church, I grant, (for the Catholick Church includes all Believers in the world) but a man may be ſaved that is no Member of the *Roman*, nor of any particular Church; for although you ingroſs to your ſelves the name of the Catholick Church, nothing is more clear that

than that the Church of *Rome* is at beſt but a part of the Catholick Church, and that a very unſound one too; and there is a falſe Church (in which ſalvation cannot ordinarily be had) as well as a true Church (out of which it cannot ordinarily be had) and I have heard more to prove yours to be this falſe Church, than I am able to anſwer, or you either, as I ſuppoſe: therefore this being only a general (and ſo an unconcluding) Argument, I deſire you to come cloſer to the point.

Pop. *Then I intreat you to conſider the danger of your way, and the ſafety of ours; ſince all your Miniſters confeſs, That a Roman Catholick may be ſaved in his Religion; but all our Church unanimouſly declare, That you are damned if you live and dye in your Religion.*

Prot. You call us Schiſmaticks; but by this Argument you prove your ſelves to be ſo: For I have oft heard it, that in the very ſame manner thoſe infamous Schiſmaticks, the *Donatiſts*, argued againſt St. *Auſtin* and the Catholick Church, that he confeſſed Salvation was to be had in their Churches, which they affirmed was not to be had in the Catholick Church; and this very thing was by St. *Auſtin*, and

the Church of that age, condemned as their great Schismatical Principle. But let that pass. To come to your Argument: Remember the condition I made with you, that you do not put me off with Fancies and bare Affirmations, for I expect you shall make good every word you say. Now here I finde you under a great Mistake, and though I have heard it most confidently delivered by divers of your Brethren, yet you must give me leave to believe my own eyes and ears: I read it in divers Books of our Learned English Divines, and I have heard it from divers very able Scholars and Ministers, That Popery in these times and places of light, is to those that may see that light and will not, not only dangerous, but damnable; nor do I pin my Faith upon their sleeves, but they have given me not meer Affirmations as you do, but such Arguments as I confess I cannot answer; yet if you can, I shall be ready to hearken to you.

Pop. *It is easie to say in general, that our Religion is dangerous or damnable, but I beseech you shew me wherein; which are those Doctrines and Practices of ours wherein the danger lies?*

Prot.

Prot. I will instance in few of many particulars:

First, That Idolatry is a damnable sin, your own Authors grant, and Scripture expresly affirms, *Idolaters shall not inherit the Kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10. and Rev. 21. 8. & 22. 15. And that your Church is guilty of Idolatry, especially in the Worship of Images, and of the Host, or Consecrated Bread in the Sacrament, is the Doctrine of all Protestant Churches, and I shall prove it before you and I have done.

Secondly, That the Worshippers of the *Babylonish* Beast, *Rev.* 13. and 14. are in a damnable condition, you all grant, and it is affirmed by God himself, *Rev.* 14. 8, 9, 10, 11. And that *Rome* is that *Babylon*, the most and Learnedest of your Doctors agree, only some of them pretend it is *Rome Heathen* as it was; and others, that it is *Rome Jewish* as it shall be in the end of the world; both which conceits are fully refuted by divers of our Authors.

Thirdly, that it is highly dangerous to trust in Man, and to trust in our own Righteousness, sufficiently appears from *Jer.* 17. 5. *Cursed is he that trusteth in Man*; and from that dreadful example of

the Church of that age, condemned as their great Schismatical Principle. But let that pass. To come to your Argument: Remember the condition I made with you, that you do not put me off with Fancies and bare Affirmations, for I expect you shall make good every word you say. Now here I finde you under a great Mistake, and though I have heard it most confidently delivered by divers of your Brethren, yet you must give me leave to believe my own eyes and ears: I read it in divers Books of our Learned English Divines, and I have heard it from divers very able Scholars and Ministers, That Popery in these times and places of light, is to those that may see that light and will not, not only dangerous, but damnable; nor do I pin my Faith upon their sleeves, but they have given me not meer Affirmations as you do, but such Arguments as I confess I cannot answer; yet if you can, I shall be ready to hearken to you.

Pop. *It is easie to say in general, that our Religion is dangerous or damnable, but I beseech you shew me wherein; which are those Doctrines and Practices of ours wherein the danger lies?*

Prot.

Prot. I will instance in few of many particulars:

First, That Idolatry is a damnable sin, your own Authors grant, and Scripture expresly affirms, *Idolaters shall not inherit the Kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10. and Rev. 21. 8. & 22. 15. And that your Church is guilty of Idolatry, especially in the Worship of Images, and of the Host, or Consecrated Bread in the Sacrament, is the Doctrine of all Protestant Churches, and I shall prove it before you and I have done.

Secondly, That the Worshippers of the *Babylonish* Beast, *Rev.* 13. and 14. are in a damnable condition, you all grant, and it is affirmed by God himself, *Rev.* 14. 8, 9, 10, 11. And that *Rome* is that *Babylon*, the most and Learnedest of your Doctors agree, only some of them pretend it is *Rome Heathen* as it was; and others, that it is *Rome Jewish* as it shall be in the end of the world; both which conceits are fully refuted by divers of our Authors.

Thirdly, that it is highly dangerous to trust in Man, and to trust in our own Righteousness, sufficiently appears from *Jer.* 17. 5. *Cursed is he that trusteth in Man*; and from that dreadful example of

the *Jews*, who *going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, did not ſubmit to* (and therefore loſt the benefit of) *the righteouſneſs of Faith*, Rom. 10. 3. and that you are guilty of this ſin, in truſting to Saints and to your own Merits, ſhall appear in the following Diſcourſe.

Fourthly, It is dangerous to add to the Word of God; and this your Church is not only deeply guilty of, in adding their Traditions (* *to be received with equal reverence to the holy Scriptures*) but obligeth all its Members to juſtifie thoſe additions, and thereby intitle them to the ſame plagues with themſelves.

Fifthly, (to name no more) it is highly dangerous to *break any of Gods commands, and to teach men ſo, and to make the word of God of none effect by humane Traditions*, we know what woes Chriſt pronounceth againſt the Phariſees for theſe things. And this your Church is deeply guilty of, as in many other particulars, ſo moſt eminently in this, that you profeſs no Men are obliged to receive the Scriptures as the word of God, nor to believe any thing in it, but for the teſtimony of your Church †

---

* *Concil. Trident.* † See my *Nullity of Romiſh Faith*, Cap. 2. Sect. 4.

By

By this it appears, that you have no reason to boaſt of the ſafeneſs of your way. And as for your threats of Damnation to all that do not ſubmit themſelves to your Church and Pope, however they may terrifie ſilly people; yet take it from me, to prudent men it is rather an argument of the falſeneſs of your Religion. For ſuch will be apt to conclude, that your Faith is not right, becauſe your uncharitableneſs is ſo notorious, and monſtrous, in condemning all the world beſides your ſelves, and that too upon ſuch frivolous pretences. This argument therefore of yours hath little weight.

Let me hear what further you have to ſay againſt our Religion.

Pop. *Then conſider ſeriouſly of this, that your Church confeſſes, that ſhe is Fallible, and that you have no Infallible Judge among you, whereby Controverſies may be ended; but our Church is Infallible.*

Prot. I confeſs now you ſpeak home; make this good, That it is neceſſary the Church ſhould be Infallible, and that yours is ſo, and I ſhall eaſe you of the trouble of further Arguments: But I muſt ask you two Queſtions: 1. What is the meaning of this Propoſition? and, 2. How you will prove it? For the firſt,

I ask you how you understand it? What is this Church which you tell me is Infallible? Are you agreed among your selves in that point? To tell me of an Infallible Judge, and not to give me infallible assurance who this Judge is, is to deceive me with vain words, and will no more end Controversies than to tell me there is an Infallible Judge in Heaven: For where I pray you shall I finde your Infallible Judge? Now I am in quest of him, I intreat your counsel and direction. Tell me then, Is it the body of your Church, and multitude of Catholicks that is your Infallible Judge? Do you make your people the Judge of Controversies?

Pop. *No, For we all agreed the Government of the Church is Monarchical.*

Prot. Are you then agreed that the Pope alone is the Infallible Judge? speak the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,

Pop. *I will deal truly with you, we are not all agreed in that point, the* French *Catholicks generally deny it, and divers of our eminent Doctors and Writers, as* (Bellarmin *confesses* *) *and among the rest a Pope,* Adrian *by name, denies it, and even they that seem*

* *De Pontifice, l. 4. c. 2.*

to

to be better minded towards the Pope, acknowledge that it is no hereſie to deny this, and that divers good Catholicks deny it, and that it is but a diſputable point *.

Prot. Is it then a General Council that is infallible? Are you agreed in that? deal truly and clearly with me.

Pop. *Then I muſt confeſs we are not all agreed in that neither: For the Pope will deny this, and all the Jeſuites and* Italian *Catholicks, and others, who aſcribe this Infallibility to the Pope only.*

Prot. Who then is this Infallible Judge?

Pop. *The Pope and a General Council agreeing together.*

Prot. Is there then at this time any General Council at *Rome*, or elſewhere, which doth agree with the Pope?

Pop. *No, but though there be no Council now in their perſons, yet there is in their writings, and the Pope agreeing with them is infallible.*

Prot. But I have been told that all your Doctors agree in this, that no Writing can be a Judge of Controverſies: If you deny this, I ſhould think the writing of God (which you all acknowledge the

* *Creſſy in Exomolog.* In the Appendix, chap. 4. num. 7. *Holden de Reſolutione fidei, l. 2. t. 1.*

Scripture to be) might challenge this priviledge as well as the writings of any Council or men. You all plead for the absolute necessity of a living infallible Judge.

Pop. *Though Catholicks are divided in the manner of expression, yet all are agreed in this general Proposition, That our Church is Infallible.*

Prot. Call you this only a difference in manner of expression, for one to say the Pope is infallible, another to say he is fallible? for some of you to affirm the infallibility of Councils, others utterly to deny it? I beseech you remember, I am inquiring after Particulars (and therefore do not put me off with deceitful Generals) who, and where is the man or men, to whom I must go to be infallibly resolved in all Controversies? For if the King should tell his people he hath appointed a Judge to end all their civil Controversies, this would be to no purpose, unless he should tell who that Judge is. So that till I hear you are agreed in this particular, my doubts and perplexities must needs remain. And then for the next point: I ask you, how you prove this Infallibility which you pretend to; I must tell you since it is the very foundation of your

your Faith, I expect very clear and undeniable Proofs, I pray you bring me two or three of your ſtrongeſt Arguments.

Pop. *In this you ſpeak reaſon, and I ſhall comply with your deſires, I ſhall give you two or three plain and evident Scriptures to prove it.* 1. *That of* Mat. 16. 18. *Hence I thus argue, The Church is ſaid to be built upon St.* Peter, *he is a Rock ſpoken of; and this Rock doth together with S.* Peter *include his Succeſſors, and the Church built upon this Rock, (that is, united to, and built upon the Pope) is infallible, for it is ſaid,* The Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.

Prot. Not one of all theſe things is true.

1. It is more probable that not *Peter's* Perſon, but his Doctrine or his Confeſſion concerning Chriſt, (which now he made) is the Rock upon which the Church is built; Scripture is its own beſt Interpreter: It is not *Peter*, but Chriſt which is the foundation of the Church, as he is called, *Iſa.* 28. 16. compared with 1 *Pet.* 2. 6, 7, 8. It is expreſly, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. *Other foundation can no man lay but that that is laid, which is Jeſus Chriſt*; and this is the more conſiderable, becauſe, he ſpeaks againſt thoſe that made the Apoſtles foundations, one ſaying, *I am of Paul, another*

another, *I of Apollos*, *I of Cephas*. And if this were spoken of *Peter*, no more is said of him here, than is said of all the Prophets and Apostles, Ephes. 2. 20. *Ye are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*——And besides, if by this Text *Peter* had been made supreme and Infallible Head of the Church, and Judge of all Controversies, no Man in his wits can believe that St. *Paul* would have treated him so irreverently (to speak the least) as he doth *Galat.* 2. (which is more considerable, because then Christ was dead, and *Peter* in the actual exercise of his Headship and Government, and if we may believe you, publickly and universally owned for such) that he would have equalled himself with him as he doth, *Verse* 7. *The Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed to me*, *as the Gospel of the Circumcision to Peter*: And that he would have spoken promiscuously of *James*, *Cephas* and *John*, that they *all seemed to be pillars*, Ver. 9. and not a word of *Peters* being the rock and foundation; and that he would have *withstood* St. *Peter to his face*, as he did, *Verse* 11.

2. If this were meant of *Peter*; yet this is nothing to his Successours. You must first prove that St. *Peter* had a Successour in

in that ſuppoſed univerſal Headſhip, which will be very hard to perſwade any underſtanding Man; for, 1. That authority which the Apoſtles had over all Churches, was peculiar to them, and died with them: we ſee God did not think it neceſſary to leave a ſucceſſour to *Moſes*, (in his full and abſolute Authority) no more was it neceſſary to leave any after *Peter* and the Apoſtles; and the reaſon is the ſame, becauſe the work of Law-giving was finiſh'd, and thoſe that came after were tyed to the execution of their Laws. 2. Beſides, if *Peter* did leave a Succeſſor, what prudent man can believe, that he would not have left ſome notice, thereof to the world in one of his Epiſtles? I find he ſaith, *I will endeavour that you may be able after my deceaſe, to have theſe things in remembrance*, 2 Pet. 1. 15. How eaſie had it been to have added, *to that end I leave a Succeſſour, whom you muſt hear in all things?* I find *Moſes* was very careful to leave a Succeſſour, and ſo was *Elias*, and *David*, and Chriſt (*as my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*): Was *Peter* the only careleſs perſon, that would not be at the expence of a word to prevent all thoſe Hereſies, Schiſms, and Contentions which were even then broached,

broached, and moſt likely to increaſe after the death of the Apoſtles in the Chriſtian world?

3. If any did ſucceed St. *Peter* in his Head-ſhip, one would think it ſhould have been one of the ſurviving Apoſtles, eſpecially St. *John*, who lived above 20 years after him; for who can believe (that regards what he believes) that *Linus* or *Clemens* who is ſaid to be St. *Peters* ſucceſſour, ſhould be ſuperiour to St. *John*; yet the foundation of all your Religion is built upon this nonſenſical opinion: And if this priviledge did belong not only to *Peter*, but ſome of his ſucceſſors; yet to ſay, it belongs to all following Popes (divers of which are acknowledged to be Apoſtatical and moſt wicked wretches) and that ſuch Monſters as were the true ſlaves of the Devil, and brands of Hell, ſhould be the foundations of the Church, by whom the Church was to be ſecured from the gates of Hell, will not find belief with ſerious Men till Eaſt and Weſt meet together: and beſides, when our Divines ſay, The Pope is Antichriſt, and the Man of ſin; you uſe to anſwer, that theſe expreſſions, *the Antichriſt*, and *the Man of ſin*, muſt needs point at a particular

lar Man, and not a whole Order of Men; which if it be true, the expreſſion there uſed of *this Rock* (eſpecially being ſo particularly levell'd at *Peter*, as you will needs have it) cannot with any colour be thought to mean a ſucceſſion of many hundreds of perſons. And ſure I am, whatever the Text ſpeaks of *Peter*, it ſpeaks not one word of *Peters* ſucceſſors, and therefore it is as eaſie for me to deny it, as you to affirm it.

3. Whatever this promiſe or priviledge is, it belongs no more to the Church of *Rome*, than to the Church of *England*, the name of one is here as clear as the other; It is a general promiſe extending to the Church at all times and places, ſignifying, that God will have and maintain a Church to the end of the World: And if this place concerns only thoſe that are built upon St. *Peter*, you grant the Church of *England* once was, as the Church of *Rome* now is, built upon him too, when it was ſubject to the Pope: And if their being built upon St. *Peter* did not ſecure them from Fallibility and Apoſtacy (as you ſay it did not) then conſequently the building of the Church of *Rome* upon St. *Peter* did not make them infallible, but they might

(as

(as we ſay and prove they did) fall away. And certainly one of theſe two things muſt be granted, either that every Church which did once adhere to *Peter*, or the Pope, are ſecured by this Text from falling away; or elſe, that notwithſtanding this Promiſe, every Church that now is ſubject to the Pope may fall away from him, and ſo the Pope may be a Head without a Body, a Shepherd without ſo much as one ſheep: For if this Text did prove what they deſire, that all that do adhere to the Pope, whilſt they do ſo, are Infallible; yet it doth not prove, that they all ſhall conſtantly adhere to him (which is quite another thing.)

4. If this Promiſe and Priviledge did belong to any particular Church, and to yours (in a ſpecial manner) yet it doth not prove your Infallibility: This place concerns Doctrines no more than Manners, and ſecures your Church no more againſt damnable Hereſies, than againſt damnable Practices, ſince the gates of Hell prevail by one as well as by the other, and ſince you acknowledge that *Peters* ſucceſſours have lived and died in damnable ſins, they might as well die in damnable Hereſies: Beſides, if this Text did prove the Popes Supremacy, yet here

is

is not one word concerning his Infallibility, which is quite another thing.

5. If this Text did prove any Infallibility, it doth not prove the Popes Infallibility (which you alledge this Text for) but the Infallibility of the Church which is built upon it.

Pop. *But that Church is Infallible becauſe they adhere to the Rock*, viz. *the Pope who therefore muſt needs be more Infallible.*

Prot. Then it ſeems the foundation of all your Infallibility is in the Pope, as *Peters* Succeſſor, whom multitudes of your own Learned and approved Doctors acknowledge to be Fallible. I have heard you all confeſs, That your Popes may erre in Manners and Practice. Is it ſo?

Pop. *Yes.*

Prot. Then whatſoever he thinks, he may ſpeak lyes, and deceive the World, in telling them he is Infallible; and ſurely if a Man will deceive for any thing, he will do it for ſuch an Empire as the Pope holds: but I have heard alſo your Popes may erre in matters of Fact.

Pop. *That we do all agree in.*

Prot. Then he may miſtake and erre in

in theſe Queſtions, whether *Peter* left a Succeſſor? and, whether the Biſhop of *Rome* be the perſon? and, whether there hath been that interrupted ſucceſſion in the Papal Chair, which you pretend to be neceſſary, which muſt be Infallibly certain, or elſe the Pope holds his Authority only upon courteſie; ſo this place will not ſtand you in much ſtead. Let me hear if you have any better Argument.

Pop. *There is another place, which if you were not an obſtinate ſort of* Men, *would ſatisfie you all, and that is* 1 Tim. 3. 15. *where the Church is called,* The pillar and ground of truth, *and therefore is Infallible.*

Prot. Let me firſt ask you, What Church is there ſpoken of, which you ſay is Infallible? Is it the Church of *Rome*? Was *Timothy* Biſhop of *Rome* or no?

Pop. *No, he was Biſhop of* Epheſus: *But why do you ask that Queſtion?*

Prot. This place apparently ſpeaks of that Church, in, and over which *Timothy* was ſet; ſo if it ſpeak of any particular Church, it muſt be that of *Epheſus* (which you confeſs was Fallible) not that of *Rome*; or if it ſpeak of the Univerſal Church,

Church, that might be Infallible, though the Pope and all the Church of *Rome* (truly ſo called) ſhould fail and periſh. Tell me, I beſeech you, in particular, What is that Church, which from this and other places, you conclude to be Infallible?

Pop. *It is the Pope with the General Council, as I have told you.*

Prot. Then I pray you make ſenſe of the verſe; for to me it is meer nonſenſe——*Timothy* is here adviſed to *behave himſelf rightly in the houſe of God, which is the Church of God, and the Pillar and Ground of Truth:* According to your opinion, this is the ſenſe of it, *That thou mighteſt know how to behave thy ſelf in the Pope and a General Council.* I pray you tell me truly, Was there a General Council then ſitting.

Pop. *No: there was no General Council from that time, till two or three hundred years after, when the Council of* Nice *was aſſembled.*

Prot. Then it ſeems to me a moſt unreaſonable thing to ſay, that *Paul* directs *Timothy* how to behave himſelf in a General Council (which was not then in being, nor like to be) and that he doth not direct him how to behave himſelf

in

in that body, the Church in which he then reſided and ruled.

Beſides, I pray you, where is the Pope or a Council called the Houſe of God? If they have any thing to do there, they are the Governours, the Stewards, the Officers of the Houſe, but are never called the Houſe of God; but this name is alwayes aſcribed to the multitude of Believers and Profeſſors, as *Heb.* 2. 5, 6. where *Moſes*, (whoſe place in the Church the Pope pretends to) is not the Houſe, but the *Servant, the Officer of it*; ſo *Heb.* 10. 21. *Having an High-Prieſt over the Houſe of God*; ſo 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Ye as lively ſtones are built up as a ſpiritual houſe*: And if you know any one place where it is otherwiſe uſed, I pray ſpeak; if not (as by your ſilence I ſee you do not) all underſtanding men will conclude that neither Pope nor Council are concerned in this priviledge. But beſides, let me further ask you, Can you give me aſſurance that theſe words which *is the ground and pillar of Truth*, imply Infallibility?

Pop. *It is true, the words are figurative and metaphorical, but that is the meaning of them.*

Prot.

Prot. My old Friend, can you advise me to venture my salvation upon a metaphor? or that that is the true and only sense of the words? Prove it, and I am your Prisoner; but it seemeth to me far otherwise. God saith to *Jeremy*, *I have made thee an Iron Pillar*, Jer. 1. 18. Was *Jeremy* therefore Infallible? Peradventure, that was too mean a metal to amount to Infallibility; but your Church is a brazen Pillar, and so it seems by the impudence of your assertions. I read in *Eusebius*, * That the Saints of *Vienna* and *Lyons*, called *Attalus* the Martyr, *a pillar and ground of the Truth*, yet you will not allow him to be infallible; by which and divers other passages it is sufficiently evident, that a Pillar in the Church is no more than a man that is well rooted and grounded and strong in the faith, as he is a reed that is tossed to and fro with every winde of doctrine; let me therefore hear if you have any better arguments.

Pop. *Then* John 16. 3. *is an expres's promise*, When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, *and therefore our Church is infallible.*

---

* *Lib.* 5. *Cap.* 1.

Prot:

Prot. Tell me I pray you, Is not this promise made to the Apostles only? If so, What is that to you? If you say otherwise, How do you make it appear that it concerns their Successors?

Pop. *That appears by comparing another place with it,* John 14. 16. The Comforter shall abide with you for ever, *not surely in their persons; for, they were to die in a little time, but in their Successors.*

Prot. I expected a place which had said at the least, that the Spirit should lead them into all truth for ever; but this is quite another thing; you dare not say, that every one with whom the Comforter abides is infallible; but to forgive you this great mistake: Tell me truly, Is it then your opinion, That all the Successors of each of the Apostles, *viz.* all Bishops, or all Ministers are infallible?

Pop. *No, in no wise, for it is only S.* Peter's *Successors, or the Pope, who is infallible, and others only so far as they depend upon him and cleave to him.*

Prot. Then this Text is not for your turn; for if it do extend to the Apostles successors, it extends either to all or none; for sure I am, this Text makes no difference: Besides, how do you prove that these words of the Spirits leading into all truth,

truth, if they do reach further than the Apostles, do imply Infallibity. Then all Believers are infallible, for they are all led by the Spirit, *Rom.* 8. 14.

Pop. *True, but here they are said to be led into all Truth.*

Prot. You know the words *all* and *every* are often taken in a limited sense, as when the Gospel is to be preached to every creature, *Mark* 16. 15. And you may as well conclude the omniscience of all Believers, from 1 *John* 2. 20. *You know all things*; and *v.* 27. *The anointing teacheth you all things*, as the Infallibility of your Popes or Councils from that phrase: and one Answer serves for both places, *viz.* that they speak of all necessary truths. But why do I hear nothing of *Luke* 22. 31. *Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired to winnow you, but I have prayed that thy faith fail not.* I have heard that *Bellarmine* useth this Argument, but I confess, I thought they abused him.

Pop. *It is true, he doth use it, and it is a solid one, though you scorn it.*

Prot. How do you know that it is meant of all *Peters* Successors? for there is not one word of them here. But if I grant these were meant, Do you then all believe that *Peter's* Successors are infallible?

Pop.

Pop. *I did before acknowledge that we are divided in that Point.*

Prot. Can you think to convince me with that argument that does not ſatisfie your own Brethren? Moreover, tell me, I pray you, What was the Faith of *Peter* which was ſtruck at by the Devil, and pray'd for by Chriſt?

Pop. *The event ſhews that; for the Devil tempted him, and prevailed with him to deny his Maſter.*

Prot. Did *Peter* deny Chriſt doctrinally, and fall into the damnable error of diſbelieving Chriſt to be the Meſſias, or was it only an error or miſcarriage of his tongue, which ſpoke againſt his Conſcience and Judgement?

Prot. *Far be it from me, to ſay that* Peter *did ſo damnably erre in his judgment, I know no Catholick who ſaith ſo; all do agree that it was only an error of his tongue and converſation, and practical denial of Chriſt.*

Prot. Very well: Hence then I gather, that Chriſt prayed for his practical, not for his doctrinal Faith, and that his grace of faith might not be utterly loſt by his fall: ſo that, if this Text and Prayer reach to your Popes, it ſhould rather ſecure them from damnable Apoſtacies in practice (which you confeſs many of them fell

fell into and died in) then from Hereſies (of which this Text ſpeaks not at all.) But have you no other Arguments?

Pop. *Yes, there is one more, which were ſufficient if there were no other, and that is from Gods Providence; It is unbecoming the wiſdom of God to leave his Church without a guide, or infallible Judge, by which means there would be no end of Controverſies: and ſince you do not pretend to have any ſuch in your Church, it muſt be in ours, or elſe there is none in the world.*

Prot. I had thought you would have only taught me, but now it ſeems you will teach God how to govern the World. It ſhould ſeem to me, that God was not of your mind; he did not think fit to end all Controverſies, but to permit that *there ſhould be Hereſies*, 1 Cor. 11. 19. And if God in his wiſdom thought an Infallible Judge neceſſary, certainly that ſame Wiſdom would have named the place, perſon, or perſons, where people ſhould have found this Infallibility. Was it ever known, ſince the beginning of the world, that any Prince conſtituted Judges in his Kingdom, not ſo much as giving notice to his people who they were, to whom they muſt reſort for Juſtice? this God hath not done; for you do not pre-

Pop. *I did before acknowledge that we are divided in that Point.*

Prot. Can you think to convince me with that argument that does not satisfie your own Brethren? Moreover, tell me, I pray you, What was the Faith of *Peter* which was struck at by the Devil, and pray'd for by Christ?

Pop. *The event shews that; for the Devil tempted him, and prevailed with him to deny his Master.*

Prot. Did *Peter* deny Christ doctrinally, and fall into the damnable error of disbelieving Christ to be the Messias, or was it only an error or miscarriage of his tongue, which spoke against his Conscience and Judgement?

Prot. *Far be it from me, to say that* Peter *did so damnably erre in his judgment, I know no Catholick who saith so; all do agree that it was only an error of the tongue and conversation, and practical denial of Christ.*

Prot. Very well: Hence then I gather, that Christ prayed for his practical, not for his doctrinal Faith, and that his grace of faith might not be utterly lost by his fall: so that, if this Text and Prayer reach to your Popes, it should rather secure them from damnable Apostacies in practice (which you confess many of them fell

fell into and died in) then from Hereſies (of which this Text ſpeaks not at all.) But have you no other Arguments?

Pop. *Yes, there is one more, which were ſufficient if there were no other, and that is from Gods Providence; It is unbecoming the wiſdom of God to leave his Church without a guide, or infallible Judge, by which means there would be no end of Controverſies: and ſince you do not pretend to have any ſuch in your Church, it muſt be in ours, or elſe there is none in the world.*

Prot. I had thought you would have only taught me, but now it ſeems you will teach God how to govern the World. It ſhould ſeem to me, that God was not of your mind; he did not think fit to end all Controverſies, but to permit that *there ſhould be Hereſies*, 1 Cor. 11. 19. And if God in his wiſdom thought an Infallible Judge neceſſary, certainly that ſame Wiſdom would have named the place, perſon, or perſons, where people ſhould have found this Infallibility. Was it ever known, ſince the beginning of the world, that any Prince conſtituted Judges in his Kingdom, not ſo much as giving notice to his people who they were, to whom they muſt reſort for Juſtice? this God hath not done; for you do not pre-

tend a particular place which settles this infallible Judge at *Rome*, but only some general and fallacious Arguments, as I have proved; and besides, it is so far from being evident, that your selves are not agreed about it: but some seek for this infallible judgement in the Pope, others in a General Council; and these do as fiercely dispute one against another in this point, as you do against us in many others; and therefore it is much more rational for me to conclude thus; God hath not nominated and appointed such an infallible Judge in the Church; therefore there is none, and it is not fit there should be one, than sawcily to undertake to be the Counsellor of the Almighty, and to tell him what is fit to be done, and then conclude that it is done. In short, For Controversies about Fundamental and necessary things, God hath provided sufficient means for the ending of them, having clearly enough determined them in his Word for the satisfaction of all that are diligent and humble, and teachable. And for Controversies of lesser moment there is no necessity of having them ended, nor would they be much prejudicial to the peace of the world and the Church if men would learn to give any allowance

fo

for the infirmities of humane nature, and exercise that great and necessary duty of Charity and mutual forbearance. But since this is all you can say upon this particular, I pray you, let me hear what other Arguments you have against our Church and Doctrine.

Pop. *Then another Argument against your Church and way, is taken from the Novelty of it; As for our Religion, it hath had possession in the world ever since the Apostles dayes; but you are of Yesterday, and know nothing; your Religion is an upstart Religion never heard of in the world till* Luthers *dayes.*

Prot. First, let me ask you this Question, If you had lived in the dayes of Christ, or of the Apostles, or of the Primitive Fathers, what would you have Answered for your self? you know better than I, that this was the very Argument, which *Jews* and *Heathens* urged against the *Christians* then; they charged Christ with not *walking after the Traditions of the Elders*, Matth. 7. 5. And the *Athenians* said to *Paul*, *May we know what this new Doctrine is?* Act. 17. 19. And the *Pharisees* had Antiquity on their side, but not *zealous for the Traditions of the Fathers*, Gal. 1. 14. And though it be true,

that the Apoſtles had the firſt Antiquity for them, delivering nothing but what for ſubſtance *was in Moſes and the Prophets*, Act. 26. 22. (which alſo is our caſe) yet the *immediate and latter antiquity* was against them, and for divers ages together theſe Doctrines had been in great measure obſcured and unknown. What then would you have Anſwered to a *Jew* or *Heathen*, objecting this Novelty to you? Learn from Chriſt, who when the *Jew* pleaded for the continuance of their old practice in the matter of Divorces; he accounted it ſufficient confutation, that *from the beginning it was not ſo*, Mat. 19. 7. And to all the pretences of the *Phariſees* from antiquity, he oppoſeth this one thing, *Search the Scriptures*, John. 5. 39. So you diſpute againſt us with the Arguments which the *Phariſees* uſed against Chriſt, and we anſwer you as He anſwered them: Beſides let me ask you this Queſtion, If I could clearly prove to you all the points of our Faith, and diſprove the points of yours, from the Holy Scriptures, tell me, Would you then acknowledge the truth of the Proteſtant Religion, notwithſtanding all this pretended Novelty?

Po

Pop. *Yes certainly, for we all confess the truth of all that is contained in the holy Scriptures.*

Prot. Hence thence it follows undeniably, that the main thing that you and I must look to in our faith is, that it be agreeable to the holy Scriptures; and if ours be so, (as I am fully perswaded it is) and yours the contrary, neither Antiquity is any argument for you, nor Novelty against us. Besides, when you charge our Church with Novelty, I suppose you mean that our Doctrines are new.

Pop. *I do so.*

Prot. Then you cannot justly charge us with Novelty; for,

1. You confess the Antiquity and verity of most of our Fundamental Doctrines, and your selves do approve them, only you make additions of your own to them; you own all the Scriptures in our Bible, only you add the *Apocrypha*: you acknowledge Scripture the rule of Faith, only you add Tradition: we believe all the Articles of the Apostles Creed (the * belief whereof the Antient Fathers though sufficient to Salvation) And the Doctrine of the four first General Coun-

* See *Potter* and *Chillingworth.*

cils, as you do alſo: You own our Doctrine of Chriſts ſatisfaction and Juſtification by Chriſt and Faith, only you add your own works and ſatisfaction: Our two Sacraments you approve, only you add five more: Our Doctrine of the two ſtates of Men in heaven and Hell you own, only you add Purgatory: You own Chriſt for your Mediator and Prayers to God through him, only you add other Mediators; Our worſhip of God you own, only you add Images. Theſe are the principal points of our Religion, and dare you now ſay that our Doctrines are new?

2. Many of your ableſt Doctors confeſs, that divers of the peculiar Doctrines of your Church are new and unknown to the Antient Fathers; and it is moſt evident and undeniable concerning Indulgences, Purgatory, Communion in one kind, Worſhip in a ſtrange tongue, the receiving ſome of your Apocryphal books, Tranſubſtantiation (eſpecially as an Article of Faith) the Popes Infallibility, Worſhip of Images, denying of the reading of Scriptures to the people and others. And will you yet brag of the Antiquity of your Religion?

3. Theſe

3. These Doctrines wherein we differ from you have been not only proved from Scripture, but from the plain testimony of Antient Fathers, as I think none can doubt that, laying aside prejudices, shall read what our *Jewel*, and *Morton*, and *Field*, and others have written; How then can you have the confidence to charge us with Novelty?

Pop. *Your Church is new in this respect, that although some others before you might own some of your Doctrines, there was no Church that owned all your Doctrines, both positive and negative.*

Prot. That is not necessary. I hope every alteration of Doctrines of less moment, doth not make the Church new; if it doth, it is most certain, that your Church is new also; for nothing can be more plain, than that the Catholick Church, nay even your own Church of *Rome*, did not antiently, in former ages hold all these Doctrines which now she owns (as your own greatest Authors confess) this is sufficient, that the Church of God, in most former ages, hath owned all our Substantial Doctrines. But what have you further to say?

Pop. *It is sufficient against you, that your Church is Schismatical, and you are all guilty of Schism in departing from the true Catholick Church, which is but one, and that is the* Roman.

Prot. I desire to know of you, Whether in no case a man may separate from the Church whereof he was a member without Schism?

Pop. *Yes certainly, if there be sufficient cause for it, for the Apostles did separate from the Church of the* Jews *after Christs death, and the Orthodox separated from the* Arrian *Churches, and all Communion with them, yet none ever charged them with Schism.*

Prot. Since you mention that instance, I pray you tell me, Why they separated from the *Arrians*?

Pop. *Because they held this Heresie, That Christ was a Creature, and not the true God.*

Prot. Very well: hence then I conclude, That if your Church do hold any Heresie, and require all her members to own it too, it is no Schism for us to separate from you.

Pop. *That must needs be granted, but this is but a slander of yours, for our Church holds no such Heresies.*

Prot.

Prot. Your Church doth not hold one, but many dangerous Errors and Heresies, as I do not doubt to manifest e're you and I part: And if you please, we will leave the present Argument to this issue, if I do not prove your Church guilty of Heresie, and the imposition of it too, I am content you should charge us with Schism; if I do, you shall mention it no more.

Pop. *You speak reason, let it rest there.*

Prot. Besides, methinks, you deal barbarously with us, you drive us out from you by your tyranny, and then you blame us for departing; as if *Sarah* had call'd *Hagar* a Schismatick for going out of *Abraham*'s family, from which she forced her: Tell me, I pray you, if the case be so that I must depart from the *Roman* Church, or from God, What must I do?

Pop. *The case is plain, you must rather depart from that Church.*

Prot. This is the Case, If I do not depart from your Church, she will force me to live in many mortal sins. I must believe a hundred lies, I must worship the Cross and Relicks, and Images, which God commands me under pain of his highest displeasure not to worship. I

must worship the Sacrament with divine worship, which I am assured is no other for substance than bread; for your Church is not content to hold these opinions, but she enjoyns these practices to all her members. And if things be thus, I think you will not have the confidence any more to charge us with Schism for obeying the command of God to come out of *Babylon*, since you force all your members to partake with you in your sins, *Rev.* 18. 4. Besides all this, let me ask you upon what account you charge us with Schism.

Pop. *For departing from the Catholick Church, and from your Mother Church of* Rome, *and from the Pope, whose Subjects once you were.*

Prot. If then I can prove that we are not departed from the Catholick Church, nor from our Mother Church, nor from any of that subjection we owe to the Pope, I hope you will acquit us from Schism.

Pop. *That I cannot deny.*

Prot. Then this danger is over: For 1. We never did depart from the Catholick Church, which is (not *your particular* Roman *Church*, as you most ridiculously

lously call it, but) *the whole multitude of Believers and Christians in the world*: Nay, the truth is, you are the Schismaticks in renouncing all Communion with all the Christian Churches in the world, except your own, (which are equal to yours in number, and many of them far superiour in true piety.) Next, we do not own you for our Mother: *Jerusalem* which is above, (not *Babylon* that is beneath) is the Mother of us all. If we grant you now are a true Church, yet you were but a sister Church.

Pop. *You forget that you received the Gospel from our hands.*

Prot. Suppose we did really so; Doth that give you authority over us? If it did, not *Rome*, but *Jerusalem* should be the Mother Church, from whom you also received the Gospel: This you deny; which shews that you do not believe your own Argument to be good. And for the Popes Universal and Infallible Authority which he pretends over all Christians, I have diligently read your Arguments for it; and I freely profess to you, I find your pretences both from Scripture and Fathers so weak and frivolous, that I durst commend it to any understanding and disinterested person as a most likely means

to

to convince him of the vanity and falſeneſs of that Doctrine, that he would peruſe any of your beſt Authors, and the very ſight of the weakneſs and impertinency of your Arguments, would abundantly ſatisfie him of the badneſs of your cauſe.

Pop. *You have no Miniſters, becauſe you have no uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, as we have, and therefore you have no Church, and therefore no Salvation.*

Prot. I obſerve you take the ſame courſe that the Adverſaries of the Goſpel ever did, who when they could not reprove the Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, they quarrelled with them for want of a Calling, as you may ſee, *Joh.* 1. 25. *Mat.* 21. 23. *Act.* 4. 7. But the good Chriſtians *of that time* took another courſe, and examined not ſo much the Call of the perſons, as the truth of the Doctrine, *Act.* 8. 17. It ſeems to me a ſecret confeſſion of your guilt, and the Error of your Doctrine, that you are ſo careful to turn off mens eyes from that to a far meaner point. But tell me, Do you believe that ſuch an uninterrupted Succeſſion of Miniſters from the Apoſtles, is abſolutely neceſſary to the being of a Church?

Pop.

Pop, *Yes verily, or elſe this Argument ſignifies nothing.*

Prot. How then can you convince me or any other Chriſtian, that you have had ſuch an uninterrupted Succeſſion in your Church? You muſt produce, and, it ſeems, I muſt read all thoſe many hundreds of great Volumes wherein ſuch paſſages are mentioned. In thoſe you muſt ſhew me a perfect Catalogue of the ſeveral names of thoſe Popes, and others who have without interruption ſucceeded one another ever ſince the Apoſtles dayes, and this Catalogue muſt be ſuch that all your Authors are agreed in, (whereas I am told for certain, they differ very much in their reports therein) and are not ſo much as agreed among themſelves who was *Peter's* next Succeſſor, (whether *Linus* or *Clemens*, or ſome other perſon they know not who), and thoſe Hiſtorians that report theſe things, you muſt aſſure me that they were infallible, (which you do not pretend they were) or elſe they might miſtake the things themſelves, and miſ-report them to me; and I have heard and read that there have been divers interruptions and Schiſms even in your Church, one Pope ſet up againſt another, and each pretending to be the true Pope, and diſ-

annulling

annulling all the Acts of the other, and that the Chriſtian people were then wofully divided, ſome cleaving to one, others to another; but it may be this was a Miſtake of our Miniſters; therefore tell me, Was this true or no?

Pop. *I confeſs it was true, after the year of Chriſt* 1300. *there were ſeveral Popes at the ſame time, one at* Rome, *another at* Avignon.

Prot. And how long did this difference laſt?

Pop. *For about* 50 *years.*

Prot. And is it true that I have heard, that your great *Baronius* reports that *for* 150 *years together the Popes were rather Apoſtates than Apoſtolicks, and that they were thruſt into the Papal Chair by the power of Harlots, and the violences of the Princes of* Tuſcany?

Pop. *I muſt be true to you,* Baronius *doth ſay ſo at the year* 897.

Prot. Then never hence forward be ſo impudent to pretend to ſuch a lawful, clear and uninterrupted ſucceſſion; but bluſh that ever you mentioned it. But beſides, I have heard that divers of our firſt reformed and reforming Miniſters too, were ſuch as had received Ordination from and in the Church of *Rome*, and from your Biſhops. Is it true, or is it not? Pop.

Pop. *I will be ingenuous, Our Doctors confeſs it; but if your Miniſters, or ſome of them had a call from our Church, yet they were only called to Preach, not to overturn the world (as they did) and to undertake the Reformation of the whole Church.*

Prot. You have ſaid enough: if they were called to the Miniſtry, their Work and Office was to bear witneſs to the Truth; and therefore to undeceive the world in thoſe many Errors and Hereſies, which you had brought into the Church: and Miniſters are ſet for the defence of the Goſpel; they were therefore bound by their Office to endeavour the Reformation of the Church, and ſalvation of Souls: and as in a great Fire (eſpecially where the publick Officers neglect their Duty) every man brings his Bucket to quench it; ſo, in that miſerable eſtate, into which you had brought the Church, (when the Pope and Biſhops would not do their duty) it was the duty of every Miniſter to endeavour, and to ſtir up the Kings and Magiſtrates of the world to endeavour, a Reformation. Surely you cannot pretend to an higher priviledge than St. *Paul*, and yet he gives all Miniſters and Chriſtians this leave and charge, that *if he himſelf ſhould bring any other doctrine*

Etrine than what he had delivered, any Miniſter (though happily ſuch a one as received his calling from him) or Chriſtian might not only forſake him, but *judge him accurſed*. I ſhall only adde this, our Miniſters are in a very hard caſe. I have diſcourſed with Anabaptiſts, who have reaſoned againſt our Miniſters as no Miniſters, becauſe they had their calling from *Rome*; and now you will make them no Miniſters, becauſe they had no Calling from *Rome*. (How ſhall they pleaſe you and them too?) But what have you further to ſay?

Pop. *I have this further (which is indeed unanſwerable) namely, the horrible diviſions of, and in, your Churches: Here is Lutheran and Calviniſt, Epiſcopal and Presbyterian, Independent and Anabaptiſt, and Quaker, and Socinian, and Familiſt; and what not? ſo that a man that would turn to your Church, knows not which to turn to: but our Church is one and entire, at perfect unity in it ſelf.*

Prot. I pray you tell me in the firſt place, are diviſions a certain Argument to prove any Church not to be true?

Pop. *I cannot ſay ſo; for it is plain, the Jewiſh Church in Chriſts time was full of Diviſions; there were Phariſees, Sadduces, Eſſenes,*

Essenes, &c. *And so was the Church of* Corinth *in St.* Pauls *time, while some said,* I am of Paul, *others,* I of Apollo, *others,* I of Cephas; *and some denyed* Pauls *Ministry and Apostleship, and some denyed the Resurrection.*

Prot. Very well, then you may blush to use such an Argument: I am told that the old Heathens did use this very Argument against the Primitive Christians.

Pop. *It is true, they did.*

Prot. What a shame is it that you are forced to defend your cause with such Weapons as were used by the Pagans, and wrested out of their hands by the Antient Fathers?

But besides, you talk of our Divisions, I pray you let me ask you, will you allow me to father all the opinions of every Papist, I read or talk with, upon your Church?

Pop. *No, in no wise, Let our Church speak for her self. It is one great fault of your Ministers, they catch up every particular Opinion of any Private Doctor, and presently charge our Church with it; though it be such as she hath condemned: whereas they should judge of our Church only by her own Decrees and Councils.*

Prot. Very well, I desire only the same justice

justice from you; Do not father upon our Church those Opinions which she dislikes and abhors: Socinians, Quakers, *&c.* are yours rather than ours, and joyn with you in abundance of your Doctrines Judge of our Churches by their publick Confessions; and there also you would find, that our divisions are generally inconsiderable, being almost all about a Form of Government, or oft-times, but a manner of expression, and none of them in fundamental Points. But since you talk of Divisions, let me ask you, are all the Members of your Church of one mind? I have been told otherwise: We hear great talk everyday of the difference between the Jansenists, and the Jesuits: and (if we may believe either of them) it is a Fundamental difference, and such as concerns the very life of Religion. I will not trouble you with other things: But are you agreed in that, which is the foundation of your unity, I mean, concerning the Supream Infallible Judge of Controversies? I remember your self told me, that some of you thought it was the Pope, and others a Council: And I have read, that Popish Nations, and Universities, and Doctors, are altogether divided about it; and for the Pope, I have heard that

that *Bellarmin* reckons up the several opinions, and amongst others, that the Pope (if he be without a general Council) *may be an Heretick, and teach Heresie: and this* (saith he) *is the opinion of divers Papists, and is determined by a Pope himself*, Adrian *the 6th. by name, in his question about Confirmation:* Is this true, or is *Bellarmin* bely'd?

Pop. *It is true*, Bellarmin *doth say so much*, * *and moreover, that* this opinion is not heretical, and is tolerated by the Church; *but withall he tells you, that he is of another opinion, which is also the common opinion.*

Prot. However, that is sufficient for my purpose. This one difference among you being far more considerable than all those points wherein Protestants differ among themselves: for though they differ in other and lesser things, they all agree in this great means of Union, that they own the Holy Scriptures to be the *Judge* (or more properly the *Rule*) of Controversies: and therefore if you please, let this pass, and let me hear what further you have to say against us, or for your selves?

* *De Pontific.* l. 4. c. 2.

Po-

Pop. *This further I ſay, the true Church muſt needs remain viſible perpetually to the end of the world, ſuch our Church hath been, whereas yours was inviſible and (as I ſaid before) unheard of in the world till* Luthers *dayes.*

Prot. I do not well underſtand you; Do you think the Church muſt needs be viſible at all times to the whole world?

Pop. *I cannot ſay ſo, for ſhe was not alwayes viſible to many great and famous parts of the world, as* China *and* America; *it may ſuffice, that ſhe is viſible in ſome Kingdom or part of the world, and that ſhe remains ſo in all ages.*

Prot. Then the Church may remain inviſible to the greateſt part of the World, and ſo your argument reacheth but a ſmall part of the World: How I pray you muſt the Church be alwayes viſible?

Pop. *There muſt be in all ages, in ſome eminent place, a great company of Chriſtians viſibly united together, in the worſhip of God in one body and Congregation, and governed by their ſucceſſive Paſtors under the Pope.*

Prot. Very well: now I know your mind: and firſt I deny, that it is neceſſary

ceſſary for the true Church to be ſo viſible in all ages: Do you prove it?

Pop. *That I ſhall eaſily prove, from thoſe many and glorious promiſes made to the Church; the Church is call'd a* great Mountain, *and ſaid to be* exalted above other mountains, *Iſa.* 2. *She is* a City ſet upon a hill that cannot be hid, *Mat.* 5. *Chriſt hath promiſed* to be with her to the end of the world, *Mat.* 28. The gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt her; Chriſts Kingdome, is an everlaſting Kingdome, *Pſal.* 88. *Dan.* 2. *A few inviſible and diſperſed Chriſtians, cannot make a Kingdome.*

Prot. Your proofs are impertinent, *Iſa.* 2. doth prove that the Church under the New Teſtament ſhould be glorious (that is ſpiritually) and prevalent: ſo it was (and we truſt will be) but he ſaith not, the Church ſhould alwayes continue in that condition (which is the point that you ſhould prove) *Mat.* 5. If it ſpeak of the Church, Chriſt only tells us what the Church then was, not that it ſhould alwayes remain ſuch; beſides he ſpeaks of their duty, not their condition: and *Mat.* 28. proves that Chriſt will be with his Church, but not ſo as that it ſhall alwayes

alwayes be illustrious and united in a great body: this, neither that, nor any of your other Texts, prove, nor can you. But suppose that Christ had made such a promise that his Church should be visible in all Ages in a considerable body; How do you prove that our Church hath not been so visible in all ages?

Pop. *If you affirm that it hath been visible in all Ages, you are bound to produce a Catalogue of your Churches in all successive Ages.*

Prot. That is not necessary neither: If I did positively affirm that our Church had been visible in such manner in all Ages, then I confess I am bound to prove it. But if I leave it in doubt as a thing which (for ought you or I know) might be true or false, he that affirms it was not so, is bound to make it good; and if I deny your Proposition, by all Laws of dispute, you must prove it: I will shew by an instance how unconvincing your argument is; There are several Prophesies and Promises in Scripture, the execution whereof is not recorded there, nor any where else; suppose an Atheist comes to you, and offers this Argument against the Scripture; If the Scripture be true, and the Word of God, then all its Prophesies and

and Promiſes were accompliſht; but there are ſeveral Propheſies and Promiſes there which never were accompliſhed within the time appointed, therefore it is not true; What would you anſwer?

Pop. *I would deny this Propoſition, viz. That there are any ſuch Propheſies or Promiſes there which were not accompliſht.*

Prot. Suppoſe then he urge it thus, If they were accompliſht, then you muſt ſhew when and how they were accompliſht either in Scripture or other Stories, if you cannot, I ſhall conclude they never were accompliſht.

Pop. *I ſhould tell him, That he is obliged to ſhew they were not accompliſht; not I to ſhew that they were accompliſht, I ſhould tell him that they might be accompliſht, though the accompliſhment of them were never put into any writing (and being but an Hiſtorical Tradition, might eaſily be loſt) or if it were put into writing, that alſo might be loſt by the injury of time, as thouſands of other Books have been, ſo that no prudent man will believe this mad Propoſition, That nothing was done in former Ages that was not mentioned in the Records which we have. But if it were poſſible that ſome particular things were not recorded, or were loſt, yet it is proba-*

ble

ble that so eminent and publick a matter as a Succession of Churches should lie hid.

Prot. I confess it is not so probable that a large and glorious Church should so lie hid; but since it was sufficient for the making good of Christs promise of being ever with his Church; if there were some few Congregations and Ministers, though scattered in divers places, that these should not be recorded, is not at all strange nor improbable to any one who considers, 1. How many matters of far greater note are recorded only in some single Author, which if he had been lost (and that he was as lyable to, as they that were lost) the memory of those things had perished with him. 2. How woefully dark and ignorant some ages of the Church were, as you all confess, wherein there was not much reading, but to be sure, there was little or no writing, and that little that was written, was written by men of the times, who would not do their Enemies that honour or right to put them into their Histories. 3. If any did mention such things, it is not at all improbable, that such Book or Books wherein they were recorded, might either be lost by the injury of time, (as thousands of other Books were, which was much more

more easie before Printing was found out, or suppressed by the tyranny of your Predecessors, who made it their business (as *Israels* enemies of old) that the name and remembrance of true Christians might be blotted out of the earth. So then, if Christ did indeed promise the perpetual visibility of his Church, I will conclude he made it good, though History be silent in the point; nor will I conclude it was not done, because it is not recorded: But I pray you let me further ask you, Is it true that I am told, that in the former ages there were many Christians and Ministers whom your Church did persecute and burn for Hereticks?

Pop. *That cannot be denyed.*

Prot. This shews there were not wanting even in former ages, some that testified against your corruptions, and this was a sign they were the true Church, (whose office it is *to contend for the Faith delivered to the Saints*) for these things were not done in a corner. I am told that your great *Bellarmine*, when it was objected against him, that the Church was obscure in S. *Hilaries* dayes, answers, that *though the true Church may be obscure by multitude of Scandals, yet even then it is visible in its strongest members, as then it was*

in Athanasius, Hilary, Eusebius, and two or three more whom he mentions: * whence I gather, that some few eminent Preachers and Professors of the Truth are sufficient to keep up this Visibility: I remember I have read in the History of the *Waldenses*, who (though your Predecessors branded them with odious names and opinions, yet) do sufficiently appear to have been a company of Orthodox and serious Christians, and indeed true Protestants, these began about 500 Years ago, saith your *Genebrard* †, and your *Reinerius*, who was one of their cruel Butchers, (otherwise called Inquisitors) writeth thus of them; *This Sect* (saith he) *is the most pernicious of all others, for three causes*; 1. *Because it is of long continuance, some say that it hath endured from the time of* Silvester; *others from the time of the Apostles*; *The* 2. *is, because it is more general, for there is almost no Land in which this Sect doth not creep.* 3. *That whereas all others by the immanity of their blasphemies against God, do make men abhor them, these having a great shew of godliness, because they do live justly before men, and believe all things well of God, and all*

* *De Ecclesiâ militante, l.* 3. *c.* 16. † *Chron. l.* 4. *the*

the Articles which are contained in the Creed, only the Church of Rome *they do blaspheme and hate.* Behold here out of your own mouths, a plain Confutation of your Objection, and a testimony of the perpetuity, amplitude, visibility, and sanctity of our Church; for it is sufficiently known that our Church and Doctrine is for substance the same with theirs. Now tell me, I pray you, if this History of them had been lost, and no other mention of them made in other Records, Had it been a truth for you to affirm, that there never were any such men and Churches in that time?

Pop. *No surely, for the recording of things in History doth not make them true, nor the silence of Histories about true Occurrences make them false.*

Prot. Then there might be the like Companies and Congregations in former ages for ought you or I know; nor can you argue from the defect of an History to the denial of the thing: And all this I say, not as if there were no Records which mention our Church in former Ages; for as I said before, it is sufficiently evident, that all our material Doctrines have been constantly and successively owned by a considerable number of persons in several Ages, but only that you may see

there is a flaw in the very foundation of your Argument. Moreover, I finde in Scripture ſeveral inſtances of ſuch times when the Church was as much obſcured, and inviſible as ever our Church was, as when *Iſrael* was in *Egypt*, ſo oft-times under the Judges, *Judg.* 2. 3. and ſo under divers of the Kings, as *Ahab*, when *Elijah* complained he was left alone, and the 7000 which were reſerved, though known to God, were inviſible to the prophet; and under *Ahaz* and *Manaſſeh*, and ſo in the *Babyloniſh* captivity: and ſo under *Antiochus*; read at my deſire, 2 *Chr.* 15. 3. 28. 24. 29. 6, 7. 33, 3, 4. ſo in the New Teſtament, how obſcure, and in a manner inviſible, was the Chriſtian Church for a ſeaſon! Nay, let me add, this perpetual viſibility and ſplendour is ſo far from being a note of the true Church, that on the contrary, it is rather a ſign that yours is not the true Church, as appears thus: Chriſt hath foretold the obſcurity and ſmallneſs of his Church in ſome after ages; he tells us that there ſhall be a general Apoſtaſie and defection from the faith, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 1 *Tim.* 4. I read of a woman, *Rev.* 12. and ſhe is forced to flée into the Wilderneſs; and I am told your own Expoſitors agree with us, that this

this is the Church which flees from Antichrist into the Wilderness, and secret places, withdrawing her self from persecution. Is this true?

Pop. *I must confess our Authors do take it so.*

Prot. Then it seems you do not believe your selves, when you plead the necessity of perpetual visibility and splendour, for here you acknowledge her obscurity; and really this place and discourse of yours does verymuch confirm me, that that obscurity which you object against us, is an argument that ours is the true Church, though, according to this Prediction, the Pope is Antichrist, did drive our Predecessors into the Wilderness, I read of *a Beast rising out of the Sea.* Revel. 13. which your own Authors, *Menochius*, *Tirinus*, and almost all Expositors (as *Riberus* saith) acknowledge to be Antichrist, and this Beast *all the Inhabitants of the world do worship*, *except those whose names are written in the Book of life*, verse 8. that is, excepting only the invisible Church; if any Church be visible and glorious at that time, it must be the false and Antichristian Church; and now I speak of that, I have heard that you your selves confess, that in the time of Antichrist

the Church ſhall be obſcure, and all publick Worſhip in the Churches of Chriſtians ſhall be forbidden and ceaſe: Is it ſo?

Pop. *It is true, it ſhall be ſo*, i. e. *during the time of Antichriſts reign, as* Bellarmine *acknowledgeth* *, *but that is only for a ſhort moment, for three years and a half, which is all the time that Antichriſt ſhall reign.*

Prot. I thank you for this, for now you have exceedingly confirmed me in the truth of my Religion; for ſince you grant that the Church ſhall be obſcured during Antichriſts reign, I am very well aſſured that your opinion of the Triennial reign of Antichriſt is but a meer dream, and that he was to reign in the Church for many hundred of years, for 1260 *dayes*, *Rev.* 11. 3. & 12. 6. (that is, *years*, it being a very familiar thing to put *dayes* for *years*, in Prophetical Writings.) But if the Church may be obſcured for three years, why not for thirty, yea, three hundred? Did Chriſt in his ſuppoſed promiſe of perpetual Viſibility in the Church, make an exception for theſe three years? I trow not: And tell me, I pray you, ſhould you live till

---

* *De Pontif. l.* 3. *c.* 7. *Denique quod,*

that

that time when Antichrist shall prevail, and your Religion no less than ours be obscure and invisible; if any of the followers of Antichrist should dispute against you, that yours was not the true Church because not visible, Would you grant it?

Pop. *God forbid I should be so wicked to deny my Mother, and Church, because of her Afflictions.*

Prot. Then I see you your selves do not believe this to be a good argument, and that you do not make perpetual visibility a necessary token of the true Church. To this I adde, there is no need we should shew a constant succession of Protestant Churches ever since the Apostles dayes, (as you pretend is necessary) the succession that you pretend in your Church is sufficient for ours, and so long as we generally agree that your Church was a true Church (till later years) though wofully corrupted, and our Predecessors continued in it, till your wounds stunk and became incurable, we need no other succession than yours; but when your impiety came to the height, then we visibly departed from you, and have given such reasons for it, as you will never be able to answer; In the mean time let me hear what you have further to say.

Pop. *For as much as all your Ministers confess our Church was once a true Church, I pray you tell me how, and when she did fall? you cannot tell either the time when she fell, or the manner how, by Apostacy, or Heresie, or Schism, if you can, name your Authors.*

Prot. This is a most unreasonable demand: A friend of mine had the Plague last year, and died of it, I askt him when he was sick, how and when he got it, he said he knew not; Shall I then conclude he had it not? Shall I make Christ a lyar, and dispute that there were no tares, because they were *sown when men slept*, Mat. 13.25. and so could not know when or how they came? Shall I believe no Heresie to be an Heresie, unless I can shew how and when it came into the Church? What if the Records of these things by the injury of time are lost, and their original left in obscurity, shall I therefore say, it is now become no Heresie? I beseech you answer me freely this question. Suppose I could bring plain and strong evidences from the holy Scripture, and from antient Tradition, or the unanimous testimonies of the Antient Fathers, that your Doctrine of Merits (for instance) is an Heresie, your Doctrine of Wor-

worshipping Images is Idolatry; and that you are in divers particulars apostatized from that faith which the Scriptures and Fathers do own; in this case, Would you not confess, that you are guilty of Idolatry, Heresie, and Apostasie?

Pop. *If it were so, and you could really bring (as you falsely pretend you can, but indeed cannot) any such solid proofs, I must and will confess it: For all our Writers agree, that although we must believe many things that are not contained in the Scripture, yet we must believe nothing contrary to the Scriptures, nor to the consent of the antient Fathers.*

Prot. Very well, hence then I gather that the only question between you and me is, Whether we can evidently and solidly prove the particulars now mentioned, which if we can do, as I am satisfied our Ministers have done, you are convicted in your own Conscience, and will confess your self and your Church guilty of Heresie, Idolatry, and Apostasie, whether I can tell the manner or time, or Authors of this doctrine or no.

Therefore leaving these frivolous and impertinent questions, let me hear what you have to say more against our Religion, and whereas your discourse I ob-

ſerve hath wholly run upon Generals, I beſeech you come to ſome particulars, and ſhew me the falſhood of the Doctrines of our Church. But it doth not a little confirm me in my Religion, that you confeſs (as I ſhewed before) moſt of our Doctrines to be true, and grounded upon Scripture, whereas yours are additions of your own deviſing. Now if things be thus, you ſhall not need to trouble your ſelf about many particulars. But if you pleaſe ſingle out ſome of our principal Hereſies, (as you call them) and let me hear what evidences you can bring againſt them.

Pop. *Your Hereſies are very many, but I ſhall mention one which may be inſtead of all, and that is your rule of Faith and Judge of Concroverſies, which you make to be the Scripture only.*

Prot. I am glad you have fallen upon ſo materlal a point, the deciding whereof may make other Diſputes in great part uſeleſs. Tell me then what you have to ſay againſt this Doctrine.

Pop. *I will urge four Arguments againſt it.* 1. *Scripture hath no authority over us but from the Church.* 2. *You cannot know what Books are the holy Scriptures, or part of it, but by the Churches report.*

3. *If*

3. *If neither of these were true, yet Scripture is not a sufficient rule for your faith without Tradition.* 4. *If it were sufficient, yet it so obscure, that you cannot know the sense of it without the interpretation of the Church. You see here is a fourfold cord, which you will find is not easily brok n.*

Prot. Make these things good, and I confess you do your work in a great measure. Let me hear your Proofs.

Pop. *For the first then, I say, that Scripture hath no authority over us but from the Church, neither you nor I are bound to beleive the Scripture to be the Word of God, nor can any man know it or prove it to be so, but from the testimony of our Church concerning it.*

Prot. I pray tell me, if you were to discourse with an Atheist, who utterly denies the holy Scriptures and the Church too, Could you not prove against him that the Scriptures are the Word of God?

Pop. *God forbid, but that I should be able to defend the truth of the Scriptures against any adversary whatsoever.*

Prot. How then I pray you would you prove it?

Pop. *I need not tell you the Arguments which in this case our Doctors use, and I*

stand

ſtand by them in it, they alledge for the truth of the holy Scriptures the teſtimony of all ages and all ſorts of perſons, the miracles wrought for it acknowledged even by the Enemies of it, the martyrdom, that ſo many thouſands (and many of them wiſe and learned men) did run upon in the defence of them (who living ſo neer the time of the writing of them were beſt able to diſcern the truth) and the wonderful power that goes along with them in convincing, converting, and comforting or terrifying ſinners.

Prot. Do you believe theſe are ſolid Arguments, and that the Atheiſt ought to yield to them?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs, for every man is bound to receive the truth, eſpecially when it is ſo propoſed and proved to him.*

Prot. It ſeems then by this, when you liſt, you can prove the Scripture to be the Word of God without taking in the Churches Authority; I hope you will allow me the ſame benefit. But again let me ask you, your Church that you talk of, which believes the Scripture to be the Word of God; Doth ſhe believe it to be the Word of God upon ſolid grounds or no?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs, our Church is not ſo irrational as to believe without grounds: nor*

do

do we pretend Revelation, but she believes it upon solid Arguments.

Prot. I wish you would give me a list of their Arguments: But whatever they be that are sufficient to convince your Church, why should they not be sufficient to convince any private man, Popish or Protestant, or Atheist? And therefore there is no need of the Churches testimony: Or will you say, the Church hath no other sufficient reason to believe the Scriptures but her own testimony, *that is*, she believes because she will believe?

Pop. *God forbid that I should disparage the Church, or give Atheists that occasion to scoff at the Scripture.*

Prot. Then I also may be satisfied without the Churches testimony, that the Scriptures are the Word of God; and I am so, by such Arguments as your self mentioned; but really I cannot but smile to see what cunning sophisters you are, how you play at fast and loose: The same Arguments for the Scriptures are strong and undeniable when you talk with an Atheist, and are all of a sudden become weak as water when a Protestant brings them.

Pop. *But if you can prove in the General, That the Scriptures are the Word of God,*

yet

yet you cannot without the Churches Authority, tell what Books of Scripture, or which are Canonical, and so you are never the nearer.

Prot. Here also I must ask you again How doth your Church know which Books are Scripture and Canonical, Doth she know this by Revelation?

Pop. *No, we leave such fancies to your Church.*

Prot. How then doth she know this and why doth she determine it? Is it with reason, or without it?

Pop. *With Reason, doubtless, being induced to believe and determine it upon clear and undoubted Evidences.*

Prot. I pray you tell me what are those Evidences upon which she goes.

Pop. *I will be true to you, our great* Bellarmine *mentions these three,* The Church *(saith he)* knows and declares a Canonical Book, 1. From the testimonies of the Antients. 2. From its likeness and agreement with other Books. 3. From the common sense and taste of Christian people *.

Prot. Since a private man (especially one that besides learning and experience

---

* *De verbo Dei*, l. 1. c. 10. *Itaq; non decimus.*

hath

hath the Spirit of God to guide him, which is that anointing given to all Believers, which teaches them all things, 1 *Joh.* 2. 27.) may examine and apprehend these things as well as the Pope himself, (and better too, considering what kind of creatures divers of your Popes are confest to have been) he may therefore know without the Churches Authority, what Books are indeed Canonical; but I pray you tell me, Do not you acknowledge those Books to be the Word of God which we do that are in this Bible?

Pop. *I must be true to you, we do own every Book you have there; but you should receive the Books which you call Apocryphal, so that indeed your Bible is not compleat, for you believe but a part of the written Word of God, which I must tell you is of dangerous consequence.*

Prot. If these Books be a part of Gods Word, I confess we are guilty of a great sin, in taking away from Gods Word; and if they be not, you are no less guilty in adding to it; so that the only question is, Whether these Books be a part of the holy Scripture or no? Now, that if you please, we will try *Bellarmines* rules.

Pop. *The motion is fair and reasonable.*

Prot.

Prot. First then, for the judgment of the Antient Church, let us try that; I know you hold the Churches judgment infallible, especially in matters of this moment; and I suppose you think the *Jewish* Church was infallible before Christ, as the Christian Church now is.

Pop. *We do so, and the Infallibility of the Jewish Church and High Priest*, Deut. 17. *is one of our principal Arguments for the Infallibility of our Church* *.

Prot. Then only these Books of the Old Testament were Canonical, which the Jewish Church did own.

Pop. *That must necessarily follow.*

Prot. Then your cause is lost, for it is certain, the Jews rejected these Apocryphal Books which you receive, and they reckoned only 22. *Josephus* his words (acknowledged for *his* by *Eusebius* †), are most expres for us, *The Jews have only 22 Books, to which they deservedly give credit, which contains things written from the beginning of the World to the times of* Artaxerxes: *other things were written afterward*, (so the Apocryphal Books are granted to have been) *but they are not of the same credit with the former, because*

* See *Nullity of Rom. faith. ch.* 2. † *Hist. l.* 3. 10.

there.

there was no certain ſucceſſion of Prophets, (*b*) and I am told divers of your learned Authors confeſs it, as *Catharinus,* (*c*) *Coſterus,* (*d*) *Marianus Victor,* (*e*) and *Bellarmine* himſelf, whoſe words are theſe; *All thoſe Books which the Proteſtants do not receive, the Jews alſo did not receive:* (*f*) and this is more conſiderable, becauſe *to the Jews were committed the Oracles of God,* Rom. 3. 2. And neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles did accuſe them of breach of truſt in this matter. Moreover, I am told (and ſurely in all reaſon it muſt needs be true) that the Canonical Books of the *Jewiſh* Church were written in the *Jewiſh* or *Hebrew* language, whereas theſe were written in *Greek* only. Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *What is true I will acknowledge; It is ſo; The* Jewiſh *Church indeed did not receive them, nor yet did they reject them, as our* Canus *well anſwers.* (*g*)

Prot. Either that Church did believe them to be Canonical, or they did not;

(*b*) *Contra Appionem,* lib. 1. (*c*) *In Annot. adverſus Cajet. de libris Maccab.* (*d*) *Enchir. c. de ſcrip. de num. lib.* (*e*) *In Scholiis ad Epiſt.* 116. *Hieronymi.* (*f*) *De Verbo Dei,* l. 1. c. 10. *In principio.* (*g*) *Loc. Theol.* l. 2. c. 11.

if

if they did, then they lived in a mortal ſin againſt Conſcience in not receiving them; if they did not, they were of our opinion.

Pop. *Well, whatſoever the* Jewiſh *Church did, I am ſure the Antient Chriſtians and Fathers did receive theſe Books as a part of the Canonical Scriptures.*

Prot. I doubt I ſhall take you tardy there too; I am told that the Council of *Laodicea*, (in the year of our Lord 364.) drew up a Catalogue of the Books of the Scripture, in which (as in ours) the Apocryphal Books are rejected.

Pop. *It is true, they did not receive them, nor yet reject them.*

Prot. If they did not receive them, that undeniably ſhews that they did not believe them to be Canonical, and yet they diligently ſcanned the point, and the Books had then been extant ſome hundred of years, and they were far more likely to know the truth than we at this diſtance, having then ſuch ſpecial opportunities of knowing the judgement of the antient Church, both *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian*: Beſides, I am informed that the famous Biſhop of *Sardis Melito*, (a man of great judgment and venerable holineſs, as your *Sixtus Senenſis* ſaith) did take a journey

journey to the Eaſtern Churches (where the Apoſtles principally preached) to finde out the true Canon of the Scripture, and returned with the ſame Canon that we own; but for the Apochrypha brought home a *Non eſt inventus*: And moreover that divers of your greateſt Champions do confeſs, that a great number of the Antient Fathers were of our opinion, among which themſelves reckon *Melito*, *Origen*, *Athanaſius*, *Euſebius*, *Ruffinus*, *Hierom*, and *Amphilocius*, ſo ſay *Canus* and *Bellarmine*, and *Andradius*; and in the General, *Sixtus Senenſis* confeſſeth, that *the Antient Fathers were of our opinion.* Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *I will not deny the truth, it is ſo; but you muſt know that other Fathers were of another minde, as* Clemens, Cyprian, *and* Ambroſe, *and eſpecially St.* Auſtin, *and the Council of* Carthage.

Prot. The Fathers of our opinion, were both far more numerous, and ſuch as lived neareſt the Apoſtolical Times, and Churches: The Council of *Laodicea* was more antient than that of *Carthage*, (and therefore of greater Authority) and beſides the ſixth Council of *Conſtantinople* doth expreſly confirm all the Decrees of the Council of *Laodicea*, among which this

this was one) and the Council of *Carthage* too doth not your work: For in their Catalogue there is both more than you own, to wit, the third Book of *Esdras*, (although they call it the second, as the *Greeks* did) and less too, for they shut out *Baruch* and the *Maccabees*: But besides all this, I am told that very many of your most eminent Doctors have disowned these Books which we reject, as the *Parisian* Divines, and Cardinal *Ximenius*, with the *Complutensian* University, and *Aquinas*, and *Lyra*, and *Pagnim*, and many others. Is it so?

Pop. *I confess this is true.* *

Prot. Then I am sure this may satisfie any rational man, concerning the Testimony of the Antient Church; and for the next point, *viz.* their agreement with the Canonical Books. I think it is plain enough that they do grosly contradict them, and the Truth too; that fact of *Simeon* and *Levi*, which good *Jacob* acted by Gods Spirit detesteth, *Judith* commends, *Chap.* 9. *Tobit* is said to have lived 202. years, Chap. 14. whereas if he said

* *Rainoldus* in his Prælections concerning the Apocryphal Books, proves this out of their own words, see *Prælect.* 40, 41, 42, 43.

true,

true, he must have lived twice as long, for he saith he was taken captive by *Salmanassar*, Chap. 1. and 2. and 14. and when he was about to die, he saith, the time was near for the return of the *Israelites* from their Captivity, and the re-building of the Temple which was burn'd: If the Books of the *Maccabees* say true, *Antiochus* his soul had a lease of his body for three lives, and he was killed thrice over, (I commend the Author, he was resolved to make sure work of him.) 1. He dies at *Babylon* in his bed, 1 *Mac.* 2. 6. then he is stoned in the Temple of *Nanea*, 2 *Mac.* 1. Lastly, he dyes in the Mountains by a fall out of his Chariot, 2 *Maccab.* 9. And the fine fetches of your Authors to reconcile these gross contradictions, put me in minde of a story we heard at School (if you remember) of a Gentleman that told this lye, * That he shot a Deer at one shot through his right ear, and left hinder leg; and you know how hard this man was put to it to help his Master out; but I will not launch forth into the Sea of untruths and absurdities that are contained in those Books; these may suffice to shew you that we do not with-

* See *Rainoldus & Spanhem de libris Apocryphis:*

out

our warrant reject them; but howsoever it is sufficient for my purpose, that you grant that my Bible is the Word of God, and these Books in it Canonical, and I can know this without the Churches Authority.

Pop. *Do not make too much haste, if I do grant that these Books in the Original Language are the Word of God, yet yours is but a Translation.*

Prot. Is it rightly translated for the substance, or is it not? What Bible is that which you have?

Pop. *A Latin Bible.*

Prot. Is that the Word of God, and rightly translated?

Pop. *Yes, the Council of* Trent *hath decreed so.*

Prot. Then I pray you let us try this Experiment; do you pick out any 20. verses in several parts of the Bible, and turn them into English out of your Bible.

Pop. *The motion is fair, I will do it.*

Prot. I do not finde any substantial difference in all these places between your Translation and mine, the difference is wholly in words, not at all in sense; so now, I thank you for this occasion, for I have heard some of your Priests ranting highly against our Translation, and now

I see they have no cause for it.

Pop. *If all this were over, yet the Scripture is not a sufficient Rule to guide you to Heaven of it self without Tradition.*

Prot. Why so I beseech you?

Pop. *Because you are also commanded there to hold the Tradition, turn in your Bible to* 2 *Thess.* 2. 15. Hold the Traditions which ye have been taught, whether by Word or Epistle.

Prot. How do you prove that he speaks of such Traditions as were not written in the Scripture?

Pop. *Because he so plainly distinguisheth between what he taught them by word, and what he taught them by Epistle or Writing.*

Prot. That may be true that he speaks of some things of which he had not written to them, and yet they might be written by him to others, or by others, at least after that time; but besides, notwithstanding this distinction between Word and Epistle, divers of your own Authors affirm, that Tradition is perfect, and that S. *Paul* taught all things necessary by word of mouth; and why may not I as well say, that he taught all by Epistle? But I pray you, What do you mean by these Traditions?

Pop.

Pop. *I mean all the Traditions which either he, or any other Apostles did deliver: all these you are bound to receive.*

Prot. I will not quarrel with you for that, bring me solid proofs of any of your unwritten Traditions; that they did indeed come from the Apostles, I promise you I will joyfully receive them; But I pray you, what are these Traditions you speak of?

Pop. *Such as these, the Doctrine of Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, of the Popes Supremacy, of the single life of Priests, of the Fasts of the Church, private Masses, Worship of Images,* &c.

Prot. And do you think, that all that did not believe and receive these Traditions shall be damned?

Pop. *No, by no means, for, then I should condemn many of the Holy Fathers and Martyrs who differed from us at least in some of these Points.*

Prot. Then it is not necessary to salvation to receive these Traditions; and the Scripture may be sufficient without them: But further, These unwritten Traditions you talk of, I beseech you how came you to discover them, and discern the true from the false?

Pop. *I altogether approve of* Bellarmin's *Rule, which is this,* That (*ſaith he*) is a true Tradition, which all former Doctors have ſucceſſively in their ſeveral Ages acknowledged to come from the Apoſtles, and by their Doctrine or Practices have approved, and which the Univerſal Church owneth as ſuch; and the reaſon is, becauſe the Univerſal Church cannot erre. *

Prot. I ſee all depends upon this Foundation, that the Catholick Church (in your ſenſe) cannot erre; which, having diſproved, I need not trouble my ſelf further: But to wave that, How I pray you do you know what former Doctors have ſucceſſively owned by word or practice? I preſume none of your Popes have ſo good a memory as to remember all that hath been ſaid or done in former Ages, though in my opinion when your inventions were upon the wheel, and you did confer upon the Pope an infallible judgment, you ſhould have given him alſo an all-ſufficient memory, and then you had done your work.

Pop. *No Sir, we pretend no ſuch thing: but we know this from the Writings which the*

* *De Tradit.* cap. 9.

Doctors have left. It is true, Bellarmine *mentions another rule, which is* the continual uſage of the Church in all ages; *but (to deal candidly with you) I cannot know what their uſe was, but by their Writings; ſo all muſt come to that.*

Prot. Firſt, then I note, you forſake your cauſe, and it ſeems a writing is now made a rule for your unwritten Traditions; if it may be ſo, let me beg your favourable opinion of the Apoſtles writings; Beſides, thoſe Writers which record theſe Traditions, were they infallible?

Pop. *No, we do not hold any particular Writers Infallible, eſpecially not in matters of Fact, ſuch as reporting a Tradition or uſe of the Church undoubtedly is.*

Prot. Then they might miſtake falſe Traditions for true: Beſides, how can I tell what the Antient Doctors did agree in, ſince moſt of them never wrote; and many of their writings are loſt; and yet all of them had equal liberty of voting in this caſe? beſides, I have heard that divers of the Antient Fathers did report ſeveral things to be Apoſtolical Traditions which your Church now rejecteth, as *that Infants ſhould receive the Communion, and that Chriſt ſhould reign on earth a thouſand years,* and many others: I am told

told also, that your great *Baronius*, writing concerning the Apostles, professeth, *He despairs to find out the truth, even in those matters which true Writers have recorded; because there was nothing which remained sincere and incorrupted:* Is it so?

Pop. *You shall find me ingenuous; it is so,* Baronius *saith it, Anno* 44. *sect.* 42.

Prot. Then truly I shall bid Tradition (in your sense) good night: For as to your Traditions I see there is no certainty in them. *Shall I forsake the certain and acknowledged verity of the Scripture for such trash?* God forbid.

Again, I pray you tell me, doth not every wise man that makes any thing, make it sufficient for its end? If you build an house to live in, will not you make it sufficient for that end? If a man makes a Sword to cut with, a Coat of Male to defend him, *&c.* is he not a fool if he doth not, if he can, make them sufficient for their end and use?

Pop. *That must needs be granted.*

Prot. And was not our Instruction and Salvation the end for which God wrote the Scripture?

Pop. *How do you prove that it was?*

Prot. God himself tells me so, *John* 20. 31. *These things are written that you*

may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his Name.

Pop. S. John *speaks there of Miracles, not of doctrins, and so that is nothing to the purpose.*

Prot. He speaks of Miracles, which were done in confirmation of the Doctrine of Christ, and so the Doctrine is not to be excluded: besides, I suppose you will not say that S. *John* wrote the Doctrines of Christ for one end, and the Miracles for another: Moreover, it plainly appears, both that this was the end for which the Scripture was written, and that it is sufficient for its end, from that 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16, 17. he saith expresly, *The Scriptures are able to make a man of God wise unto salvation.* *

Pop. *Well, but if all these things be so, yet since the Scripture is dark and doubtful, and you can never apprehend the true meaning of it but from the Church, you are never the nearer; and the Scripture is not a convenient judge of Controversies.*

Prot. Tell me I pray, doth your Church understand the true meaning of the Scripture?

Pop. *Yes doubtless, because she hath the Spirit of God.*

* Of which see *Nullity*, Append. p. 92.

Prot.

Prot. Then certainly she is most deeply guilty of uncharitableness, or envy, or cruelty to souls, that she doth not put forth a clear and infallible Comment upon the whole Scripture, but still suffers the whole world to live in contention about the true meaning of hundreds of Texts of Scripture.

Pop. *She forbears that, for reasons best known to her self: But this is not much to the purpose.*

Prot. Whereas you pretend your Church certainly knows the true sense of the Scripture, and this Church you say is the Pope, or a Council, and if these be infallible, you say they are so in their Decrees: If this be so, how comes it to pass that none do more grosly mistake, and mis-apply Scripture than divers of your Popes and Councils have done, even in their Decrees, and decretal Epistles (which you reverence as the Gospel)? Your Pope *Nicholas* the first, proves his Supremacy from that Text, *Arise Peter kill and eat:* small encouragement to us to become his sheep, if he so use them; and from hence, that *Peter drew to the shore his net full of Fishes*, your Pope *Boniface* the eighth proves it from *Gen.* 1. 1. *In the beginning God created Heaven and Earth,*

therefore the Pope hath power in Temporals and Spirituals: and this (ſaith he) *you muſt hold, unleſs with the Manichees you hold two principles:* And your Councils are not more happy Expoſitors. The Council of *Lateran* proves the Popes power from *Pſa.* 72. (which ſpeaks of *Solomon* and Chriſt) *All Kings ſhall fall down before him.* The ſecond Council of *Nice* alledges theſe Scriptures for the Worſhip of Images, that *God created man in his own Image*, Gen. 1. *Let me ſee thy countenance*, Cant. 2. *No man when he hath lighted a Candle covereth it under a veſſel*, Luk. 8. 16. In my opinion they ſpoke like a Council, expecting that the world ſhould receive their Decrees, not for any ſolidity of Argument (that had been pedantick) but meerly for the Churches Majeſty and Authority. Nay, the jeſt is, when their Adverſaries had taken notice of theſe abſurd impertinencies, up ſteps *Pater Noſter*, Pope *Adrian*, and he ſaith, he will maintain it (in ſpite of fate) that they alledged them rightly and excellently: So here we have a Pope and Council joyning together (and therefore undoubtedly infallible) in theſe Expoſitions. Nay, the Council of *Trent* it ſelf (when one would expect they ſhould have grown wiſer, though not better) prove

prove the unequal power of Popes, Bishops, and Priests, from *Rom.* 13. 1. *The powers that be are ordained of God; that is, digested into order.* I hope ere you have done, you will put forth an entire Comment upon the whole Bible, which I assure you will be the rarest book that ever saw the light. But further, I desire to know of you how your Church comes to have this true and certain sense of Scripture; hath she it by Revelation or Inspiration?

Pop. *No, we pretend to no such thing; but she comes to know it by the diligent use of means, by prayer, by reading, and comparing Scripture, by consulting ancient Interpreters, Analogy of Faith, the coherence,* &c. *and even the Pope himself, when he set forth his Translation of the Bible, He professes to all the world, that he did it in the very same manner, and by the same helps, that other translators do; that is, by advising with learned Men, and consulting Antient Copies, and the like.**

---

* Sixtus *the* Fifth, *Pope, tells us in his Preface to his Translation of the Bible, that* He pickt out of the Cardinals, and almost out of all Nations, a Colledge of most learn-

ned men, who adviſed him in that work; They (*ſaith he*) conſulted, and I choſe that which was beſt. *And he adds theſe remarkable words*, It is moſt evident, that there is no ſurer, nor ſtronger Argument, than the comparing of ancient and approved Copies. *And (he tells us) that* he carefully corrected it with his own hands. *And then the Pope impoſeth this Tranſlation upon all the world*, to be followed without adding or diminiſhing, or altering, under pain of Excommunication. *And yet (that you may ſee how they abuſe the peoples credulity to make them believe the Popes Infallibility which themſelves do not in earneſt believe.) About two years after comes* Clement *the Eighth, and he puts forth another Edition and Tranſlation of the Bible, differing from, and contrary to the former Edition in two thouſand places, as Doctor* James *hath proved, by producing the places, as they are in* * *both Editions. And which is more than all this, in the Preface to his laſt Bible of* Clement *the Eighth, we have theſe words*; Receive, Chriſtian Reader, this old and vulgar Edition of the Scripture corrected with all poſſible diligence, which, though in reſpect of humane weakneſs it be

* In his *Bellum Papale*, and defence of it.

be hard to affirm, that it is every way compleat; yet it is not to be doubted, but it is more pure and corrected than all that hath gone before it. *I think this were sufficient evidence (if there were no other) how great a cheat it is, that you pretend the Pope to be the infallible Interpreter of Scripture. For here we have one of those infallibles directly contradicting and overturning the other: and besides, instead of that Divine, (or, after a sort divine) infallibility, which you ascribe to the Pope, we have here a publick acknowledgment of his imbecillity: nor dare he affirm his work to be perfect, which it must need have been, if he had been infallibly guided in it (as you pretend he was) nor would he have said so, if he had believed his own infallibility.*

Prot. Very good, Then I pray you tell me why a Protestant Minister (being oft times both a learneder and better man than the Pope) may not as certainly hit upon the true sense of the Scripture as the Pope himself.

Pop. *The reason is plain, because the Pope is guided by the infallible assistance of Gods Spirit.*

Prot. You ought not to rant at this height, until you have solidly answered

what our Divines have wrote againſt this Infallibility. And I heard before the woful weakneſs of your arguments; for it is to me the vaineſt thing in the world to pretend a promiſe of the Spirit of God infallibly to guide ſuch men as (if the Scripture be true) have not the Spirit of Chriſt in them, being (as you confeſs many of your Popes and Biſhops were) *ſenſual, not having the Spirit:* and having apparently no other ſpirit in them, but the ſpirit of the world, the ſpirit that luſteth to envy and all wickedneſs: But ſince you pretend the Scripture is ſo dark, I pray you tell me, what was the end for which God deſigned the Scripture? Sure I think it was for our underſtanding; my Bible tells me, that *whatſoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning*, *Rom.* 15. 4. But if you ſay true, it ſeems God meant only to put forth riddles: Gods Law was deſigned by him for *a light, and that even to the ſimple*, Pſal. 19. 7, 8, 9. and 119. 105. And in a word, the Goſpel is ſo clear, that Saint *Paul* pronounceth, it *is hid from none but them that periſh*, 2 Cor. 4. 3, 4. And Saint *Luke* wrote his Goſpel, that *Theophilus* (and with him other Chriſtians) *might know the certainty of thoſe things* where-

wherein they had been instructed, Luke 1. 4. and generally every discreet man that writes a Book, writes it so, as it may be understood; especially if it be for the benefit of the ignorant, as well as the learned (which the Scripture assuredly was.) Tell me then I pray you, why should God write his mind so darkly and doubtfully as you know whose Oracles are said to be delivered? was it because God could not write plainer (and wanted the gift of utterance) or because he would not?

Pop. *Notwithstanding all this, it is certain, the Scripture is full of obscure places.*

Prot. I do not deny this; but those things which are obscurely delivered in one place, are more clearly delivered in another; and those dark places generally are about Prophecies, and such other things; the knowledge of which is not necessary to salvation. But for necessaries the Scripture is plain, and I am told, that divers of your Authors acknowledge so much: Is that true?

Pop. *I confess* Costerus *hath this expression*, that things which are necessary to be known by all Christians, are plainly and clearly delivered in the writings of the Apostles

Apostles, *and some others of our Doctors say as much.* *

Prot. It could be nothing but the evidence of the truth which forced such an acknowledgment from its greatest Adversaries, therefore let this go, and let me hear what further you have to say against our Religion.

Pop. *I find you are an obstinate Heretick, and setled upon the lees, and therefore it will be needless to discourse further with you; if any thing could have convinced you, surely the Arguments I have offered would have done it; for I assure you I have pickt out the strength and marrow of the Catholick Cause in the Points we have discoursed. And since I see you turn a deaf ear to my counsel, I shall give you over as incorrigible.*

Prot. You see I have heard you with great patience, and given you all the freedom you could desire; now I have one request to you, that you would allow me the same priviledge, with patience to hear, and, if you can, answer what I shall object against your Religion.

Pop. *With a very good will, I'le meet you here to morrow at this time, so at present adieu.*

---

* See nullity of *Rom.* faith, *chap.* 7. *sect.* 4.

The

The SECOND CONFERENCE.

Prot. WEll met Sir, I see you are as good as your word, and I hope you will allow me as much freedom and patience as I did you.

Pop. *I shall willingly do it, therefore speak freely, and so will I, and if Truth be on your side let it prevail.*

Prot. I shall divide my discourse into two Parts.

1. Some General Considerations, which indeed do very much set me against your Religion.

2. I shall examine the grounds of your Principal Points of Doctrine; for to meddle with all, will be needless: If your Pillars fall the rest cannot stand. For the first, there are several weighty Considerations against your Religion; I shall give you them in order. The first General Consideration is this;

I. That your Church declines all Judgment

Judgment but her own, and makes her self Judge in her own Cause; you do not allow Scripture to be Judge, nor the Antient Fathers (for all your talk of Antiquity) nor indeed any but your selves, the Pope, or a Council of your own; and your Church it seems must determine, whether she be a true Church or no, and whether she be pure or corrupted, or whether she be Infallible or no; Is this so?

Pop. *I confess this is our Doctrine, and I think grounded upon Reason.*

Prot. You speak against the common sense of all men. In all Controversies or Differences between men and men, we generally suspect that party who will submit to no judgment but his own; and he who is willing to refer himself to any third indifferent party, is generally presumed to have the best cause; and this is our case, Protestants do not make themselves and their own Church the only Judge (though they might as justly and reasonable do it as you) but they are very willing to submit to other Judges, they refer themselves to be judged by the Scripture, which is acknowledged to be a most indifferent Judge; If that do not please you, they refer themselves to the Fathers for the first six hundred years,

years, till your abominations had leavened the world, according to what was foretold, *Rev.* 13. 8.

II. My second Consideration is this; You do not only decline the Scriptures judgment, but you infinitely disparage and vilifie it. I meet with several passages quoted out of your Authors to that purpose.

Pop. *Possibly you may out of some inconsiderable ones, but not out of any of note and name in our Church.*

Prot. Yes, out of your prime Authors, I read that Cardinal *Hosius* in his *Advertisement to King Sigismund* hath this expression, *If they* (that is, the Hereticks) *say, It is written, that is the voice of the Devil, speaking in his members* (a). But that it is below a Cardinal to read the Bible, he would have found the words also in Christs mouth. I read that *Costerus* calls the Scripture by way of contempt *Paper and Parchment. God* (saith he) *would not have his Church* (by which always understand the Papists themselves) *now depend upon Paper and Parchment, as* Moses *made the carnal* Israelites: And again, *That which is written in the heart of the Church, doth by many degrees*

(a) *De expresso Dei Verbo.*

exce

excel the Scriptures: First, because that was written by the finger of God, but this by the Apostles (*a*), as if the Writings of the Apostles were only a device of man. I read that Cardinal *Pool* writing to *Henry* the Eighth, saith thus, *What an absurd thing is this, that thou dost attribute more authority to the Scripture than to the Church, since the Scripture hath no authority but for the decree of the Church* (*b*)? (He means the *Roman* Church.) I see we are highly concerned to please your Church, else we are like to have no Scriptures. I read that *Pighius* saith, *The Apostles did never intend to subject our faith to their writings, but rather their writings to our faith* (*c*). And afterward he saith, *The Scriptures are* (*as one said, not more pleasantly than truly*) *a nose of wax which suffers it self to be drawn hither or thither, as a man pleaseth* (*d*). I read that *your Bullenger* saith; *The Scripture is the Daughter, the Church the Mother, which gives being and sufficiency to her she begets.* (No wonder then, the Church makes bold with the Scripture to add, or

---

(*a*) *Enchiridon, cap.* 1. (*b*) *De primatu Romanæ Ecclesiæ, fol.* 92. (*c*) *Eccles. Hierach. lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. (*d*) *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 3: *fol.* 103.

alter,

alter, or dispense with it. We all know the Mother may correct the Daughter.) I confess, when I read those passages produced by our Writers, I suspected they wronged them. Are these things true?

Pop. *I acknowledge it, and it is a vain thing for me to deny it, for the Books and those passages in them are extant under their own hands: And I must confess, these Authors are as considerable and approved as any we have. But you ought to put a favourable sense upon them.*

Prot. I would not strain them, nor make them worse than they are. Take them as you will, they are abominable expressions, and (to me) a great evidence, that the Scripture is no friend to your Church. And I conclude this to be one accomplishment of what Christ hath said, *Every one that doth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved*, John 3.20. And if this be the spirit by which your Church is guided, I am sure it is not the Spirit of God and of Truth; for that teacheth men reverence and love to the Scriptures. You seem to do like *Herod*, who being convinced that he was not of the Royal race of the *Jews*, did burn their Genealogies

gies and Records, that his false pretences might not be confuted by them. And just so do you endeavour to do by the Scriptures.

III. My third Consideration against your Religion is this; That your Cause is such as dares not abide tryal: This is the honour and happiness of our Religion; We are allowed to examine all that our Ministers say, and we have a Rule (which we may peruse) to try them by, *viz.* the holy Scriptures, which you dare not suffer your people to read. And this I take to be a secret confession of your guilt; and I am told your *Alphonsus de Castro* saith, *That from the reading of the Scripture all Heresies come* *.

Pop. *I think your experience hath justified that expression, You see what you get by the reading of the Scriptures, even this, that you are crumbled into a thousand Sects.*

Prot. Our Saviour was not of your mind, for he thought not acquaintance with, but ignorance of the Scriptures was the cause of Error; *Ye erre, not knowing the Scriptures*, Matt. 22. 29. Nor did he only allow, but command the *Jews* to *search the Scriptures*, without any fear of

* *Contra hæreses, l. 5. c. 6.*

this

this inconvenience, *John* 5. 39. Had S. *Paul* been of your mind, he would not have commended, but reproved the *Beræans* for ſearching the Scriptures, and examining his Doctrine by them, *Act.* 17. 11. If any of your people ſhould do as the *Beræans* did, they would be ſent to the Inquiſition. I do not deny, but too many make a bad uſe of the Scripture, and wreſt it to wicked purpoſes, which is to me no better an argument than this; Wine makes many men drunk, therefore no Wine muſt be ſold. The Doctrine of Free Grace was abuſed by thouſands (as we read) therefore S. *Paul* did ill in preaching of it. The light of the Sun hurts ſore eyes, therefore *Solomon* was miſtaken, when he ſaid, *It is a pleaſant thing to behold the Sun.* But ſince you ſpeak of this, I pray you let me ask you one queſtion; Were not moſt of the Hereſies that ever were in the Church, brought in by learned men?

Pop. *I cannot deny that, for it is notoriouſly known.*

Prot. Then you ſhut up the wrong door; for, it ſeems, it is not the unlearned mans reading, but the learned mans perverting the Scripture, which is the true cauſe and fountain of Hereſies:

And

And besides, you must not do evil, that good may come out of it, nor defraud people of their greatest treasure, nor keep them from their duty, for fear of some inconveniencies. This is to make your selves wiser than God.

Pop. *But indeed you slander us in this point: We do not absolutely forbid reading of the Scriptures. The Council of* Trent *allows it, provided you can get the Bishops leave.*

Prot. It is true, that Council pretends to give some such liberty; but they take away with one hand, what they gave with the other; for in their Index of forbidden Books, they have this passage: *Since experience sheweth that the promiscuous reading of the Bible brings more evil than good, therefore if any man shall dare to read, or have a Bible without license from the Bishop, or Inquisitor, he shall not be capable of absolution* * *unless he part with his Bible.* But in truth, this pretended License is but an handsome blind: For in that very place there is this Observation added to that Rule, That *the power of giving such Licenses of reading, or keeping the vulgar Bibles, is taken away from such Bishops and*

* In fine *Concil. Trident. Reg.* 4.

Inqui-

Inquiſitors, by the command and uſage of the Roman *and univerſal Inquiſition.* At beſt, it ſeems, I muſt not obey Chriſts command of *ſearching the Scriptures*, unleſs the Biſhop give me leave. But I pray you tell me; Do your people uſe to ask, and the Biſhops to give them leave to read the Bible?

Pop: *I will not diſſemble with you, They do not. And, the truth is, an approved Writer of ours,* Ledeſima *puts the queſtion*; What if a man ſhould come to the Biſhop, and deſire liberty to read the Bible, and that with a good intention? *to which he replies, that* the Biſhop ſhould anſwer him in the words of Chriſt, *Matt.* 20. 20. Ye know not what ye ask, and Indeed (*ſaith he, and he ſaith it truly*) the root of this demand is an heretical diſpoſition *.

Prot. Then I perceive in this, as well as in other things, you are more careful to deceive people with pretences, than to inform them. But indeed, you tell me no more than I had read, or heard out of your own Authors. It was the ſpeech of your Pope *Innocent*, That *the Mountain which the Beaſts muſt not touch*

* *De Sacris vernaculis.*

is

is the high and holy Scriptures which the unlearned must not read *, and your Doctors commonly affirm, that people must not be suffered to read the Scriptures, becauſe *we must not give holy things to Dogs, nor caſt Pearls before ſwine.*

My fourth General Conſideration againſt your Religion is this, That it groſly contradicts the great deſigns and ends of the Chriſtian Religion, which all confeſs to be ſuch as theſe, the glorifying of God, and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, and the humbling and abaſing of men, the beating down of all ſin, and the promoting of ſerious holineſs. Are not thoſe the chief ends of Religion?

Pop. *I do freely acknowledge they are, and our Religion doth moſt anſwer theſe ends.*

Prot. That you and I will now try. And for the firſt: Your Religion doth highly diſhonour God ſundry ways. What can be a greater diſhonour to God, than to make the holy Scriptures (which you confeſs to be the Word of God) to depend upon the Teſtimony and Authority of your Pope, or Church, and to ſay, that the Word of God is but a dead

* *Cap. cum ex injuncta. Extra de hæreſ.*

letter,

letter, and hath no authority over us without their Interpretation and Approbation; By which means malefactors (for such all men are, *Rom.* 3. 9, 10. your Pope not excepted) are made Judges of, and superiour to that Law whereby they are condemned. Tell me; would not the *French* King take it for a great dishonour, if any of his Subjects should say, That his Edicts and decrees had no Authority over his People without their approbation?

Pop. *Yes, doubtless he would.*

Prot. Just so you deal with God: and what can be a fouler dishonour to God than that which your great *Stapleton* affirmed, and *Gretser* and others justified, and your Church to this day have never disowned it: *That the Divinity of Christ and of God* (in respect of us) *depends upon the Authority of the Pope?* * And what more dishonourable to God than what your great Champion *Bellarmine* saith, That, *if the Pope should erre in forbidding Virtues* (which God hath Commanded) *and commanding Vices* (which God hath forbidden); And that he may so erre, divers of your most famous and approved

* *Triplicatio contra* Whitak, c. 17.

Au-

Authors confeſs, * *the Church were bound to believe Vices to be good, and Vertues bad, unleſs ſhe would ſin againſt Conſcience*; † that is, in plain terms, the Pope is to be obeyed before God. Again, is it not highly diſhonourable to God, to give the Worſhip which is proper to God, unto the Creature? I confeſs the Prophet *Iſaiah* hath convinced me of it, *Iſa.* 42. 8. *I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praiſe to graven Images.*

Pop. *I alſo am of the ſame mind; but it is a ſcandal of your Miniſters, to ſay we give Gods honour to the Creature: I know where about you are, you mean it of Images, whereas we worſhip them with a lower kind of Worſhip.*

Prot. You worſhip them with ſuch a kind of worſhip, as neither Angels nor Saints durſt receive. *Cornelius* did not worſhip *Peter* with a Divine Worſhip as God (for he knew he was but Gods Miniſter) yet *Peter* durſt not receive it. It was an interiour Worſhip which the Devil required of Chriſt, for he acknowledges at the ſame time, God to be his Superiour and the giver of that power he claimeth

---

* See *Nullity.* † De *Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 5.

Luke

Luke 4. 6. And yet that was the Worship, which Christ saith God hath forbidden to be given to any Creature. You are a valiant man, that dare venture your immortal soul upon a nice School distinction. I pray you, do you not worship the Bread in the Sacrament, with that worship which you call *Latria*, which is proper to God?

Pop. *We do so, and that upon very good reason, because it is not Bread, but the very Body of Christ into which the Bread is turned.*

Prot. But what if the Bread be not converted into Christs Body: Is it not then an high dishonour to God, and indeed damnable Idolatry?

Pop. *Yes, our* Fisher *the famous Martyr and Bishop of* Rochester, *saith*, No man can doubt, if there be nothing in the Eucharist but Bread, that the whole Church hath been guilty of Idolatry for a long time, and therefore must needs be damned *; *but we are well assured, that it is no longer bread; and yet I must add this; If peradventure it should still remain Bread, yet forasmuch as we believe it to be the Body of our Lord, our ignorance, I hope, would*

* *Roffensis contra Oecolampadiam*, c. 2. fol. 3.

excuse us from Idolatry, and God would not impute it to us.

Prot. Tell me, I beseech you, Will all kind of ignorance excuse a man?

Pop. *No certainly, There is a wilful and affected ignorance; which, because it is against clear light, will not excuse.*

Prot. Tell me farther, Did this excuse the *Jews* from their sin of crucifying Christ, and the damnation due to it, that *they did it ignorantly?* Act. 3. 17.

Pop. *No, because they shut their eyes against the plain light, and clear evidence of that truth that Christ was the Messias.*

Prot. No less do you in the doctrine of the Sacrament; for they had no greater evidences against them, than Sense, and Reason, and Scripture; all which you reject, (as I shall prove by Gods help.) And as your Religion dishonours God, so doth it also highly dishonour Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, who is expresly called the *one Mediatour*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. But you have conferred that honour upon many others, Saints and Angels.

Pop. *True, there is but one chief Mediatour, but there may be other secondary Mediatours.*

Prot. In like manner, to that which the Apostle there saith, *there is but one God;*

God; it might be said, there are other secondary gods, and so we might introduce the Heathen gods into the Church. It is the great Prerogative of Jesus Christ, that he is the Redeemer of the World; yet your *Bellarmine* was not afraid to communicate this honour to the creature, and expressly saith, *It is not absurd, that holy men be called our Redeemers after a sort* *; and more of the like stuff we shall meet with before we part: yet again, your Religion as it depresseth God, so it exalts the creature. I will instance but in one thing, and that is your Doctrine of Justification by the merit of good works: A Doctrine, which S. *Paul* affirms, gives unto a man matter of boasting and glorying, Rom. 3. 27. *Where is boasting then? it is excluded, By what Law? of Works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith*, & Rom. 4. 2. *For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory.* Next, you grant, That it is the great design and intent of Religion, to discourage and beat down sin, which your Religion doth exceedingly incourage by your Doctrines and Practice in Absolutions and Indulgences. In my acquain-

* *De Indulgentiis*, cap. 4. *sub fiaem.*

tance, I have known ſeveral Papiſts that have wonderfully encouraged themſelves in their wicked wayes from this conſideration; eſpecially when *Eaſter* drew near, becauſe they knew they ſhould very ſuddenly be ſhriven, and abſolved, and he (as they ſaid) as ſound and clean as when they came firſt into the world. I have known alſo divers of our looſe Proteſtants that have turn'd to your Religion, that they might have greater liberty for, and ſecurity in ſin; and in my Conſcience, If I would let my luſts chooſe a Religion for me, they would preſently lead me to your Religion: And ſo again, your Religion doth not at all promote ſerious holineſs, but the ſoul and ſpirit of it is dwindled away into meer formality: What can be of more peſtilent conſequence to true holineſs than to tell a man, that the ſaying ſo many *Pater-Noſters*, or *Ave-Maries*, (though it may be he is talking, or gazing about in the midſt of his Devotions) will procure him acceptance with God? Is it true, that your great and devout Doctor *Suarez* ſaith, That *it is not eſſential to Prayer, that a man ſhould think of what he ſaith?*

Pop.

Pop. *It is true, he doth say so in his Book of Prayer.*

Prot. Then I confess, your Religion hath the advantage of ours, for a man may do two businesses at once: It hath set me much against your Religion, since I understood that you turned that great Doctrine of Repentance into a meer formality: What a sad Doctrine it is that your great Masters teach, that Repentance is not necessary at all times, but only on Holy-dayes, (as some of your Authors say) only once in a year, that is, at *Easter* (as others,) Nay indeed, once in all his life, and that in danger of death (as *Navar*, and *Cajetan*)? what an encouragement is this to wickedness, to tell men that a thousand of their sins are venial, which though not repented of, will not exclude them from the favour of God, and from Salvation; but I will rake no farther into this kennel.

I think this may serve turn, to let you see, that I had warrant to say, That your Religion contradicts the design, and end of all Religion.

V. The fifth Consideration that sets me against your Religion, is, the desperate issues that you are driven to in the de-

fence of your Cause; as for example, in the great point of Infallibility, I observe your learned Doctors are beaten out of all their former Assertions and Opinions; you have been driven from Scripture to the Fathers, from them to the Pope, from him to a Council, and thence to the Pope with a Council and (as a further sign of a desperate cause) the Jesuites are brought to that exigence, that they are forced to affirm the Pope to be infallible in matters of fact, which is confessedly a new, upstart, and indeed, monstrous Opinion; and yet those piercing wits see their cause cannot be defended without it: and others seeing the vanity of all their former pretences, have been forced to resolve all into the present Churches testimony. * So for the point of Idolatry, you are driven to those straits, that you cannot excuse your selves from Idolatry, but by such pretences as will excuse both Jewish and Gentile Idolaters; and one of your ablest Champions is brought to this plunge, that he is forced to affirm, that *some Idolatry is*

---

* See *Nullity, Chap.* 5.

law-

lawful *. I might instance in very many others, but I forbear.

VI. A sixth Consideration is taken from the partiality of your Religion; That Religion which is from God, is doubtless agreeable to the Nature and Will of God. But so is not your Religion, for it is guilty of that respect of persons which Scipture every where denies to be in God, *Act.* 10. 34. *Rom.* 2. 11. *Job* 34. 19.

Pop. *How is our Religion guilty of respect of persons?*

Prot. I might shew it in many things, but I will confine my self to one particular; and that is, in point of Indulgences: The Souls of all that die in venial sins, are doomed to those terrible pains of Purgatory, there to continue none knows how long (by the way, I cannot but take notice of the great unhappiness of those Christians, that lived and died in the dayes of Christ and the Apostles, that have been multitudes of them frying in Purgatory to this day, and are like to be so as long as the World lasts; whereas those that live nearer the end of the World, must needs have a far shorter abode there, so men are punished

* *Greg. de Valentiâ.*

with continuance of their torments meerly for the circumſtance of time of their birth; but this is not the thing I aim at,) from theſe pains of Purgatory, there is no way to deliver a man but by indulgences; and theſe indulgences muſt be bought off with money, and wealthy men may buy off thoſe corporal pains, (which the raſcal herd muſt ſuffer without bail or main-priſe) and turn them into a Fine of the purſe. So I ſee it was not without reaſon, that *Solomon* ſaid, *Money anſwers all things.* I have heared that your tax of the Apoſtolical Chancery (put forth by the Authority of your Church, where there is a price put upon all indulgences, and upon all kinds of ſins) hath this expreſſion, *Diligently note, that theſe graces* (of Indulgences) *are not given to the Poor, becauſe they are not, and therefore cannot be comforted* (*a*); by which I ſee, that if St. *Peter* himſelf ſhould riſe from the dead, and come to his Succeſſour, with his old tone, *Silver and Gold have I none*, if he were a thouſand *Peters*, he

(*a*) *Diligenter nota quod hujuſmodi gratiæ non dantur pauperibus*, quia non ſunt, *ideo non poſſunt conſolari. Taxa Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ.* Tit. De Matrimoniali.

muſt

must into Purgatory without mercy. I am told that another of your Authors, *Augustinus de Ancona*, an Author of great note with you, tells us, that *Indulgences are for the relief of the Churches* (that is, the Popes, and their Prelates) *Indigencies, which* (*b*) *is not relieved by a willingness to give* (which is all that any poor man can pretend to) *but by the gift it self.* (It seems your Church is not of Gods minde, for if *there be a willing mind, he accepteth it for the deed*, 2 Cor. 8. 12.) And a little after (as I am told) he saith, *as to the remission of punishment which is procured by indulgences, in that case it is not inconvenient that the rich is in a better condition than the poor, for there, it is not said, come and buy without money* (*c*). I confess that were a dangerous speech, and would utterly undoe all the Church of *Rome*. It is sufficient that *Isaiah* once said it, and Christ again, *come and drink freely*. People should have been wise, and taken them at their word, for they are never

(*b*) *Nam Indulgentiæ fiunt ad relevandam indigentiam Ecclesiæ, quæ non relevatur per solam voluntatem dandi, sed per datum.* De Potestate Papæ, quest. 30. art. 3.

(*c*) *Quantum ad remissionem pœnæ quæ acquiritur per indulgentiam, in tali causa non est inconveniens, quod dives sit melioris conditionis quàm pauper. Ibi enim non dicitur. Venite & emite sine pecuniâ.* Ibid.

like to hear it a third time. Is this true?

Pop. *They do indeed say so, and the practice of our Church manifests to all the world, that Indulgences are sold for money, and the condition of the rich, in that, is better than the poor. But what great matter is that, as to the Pardon of Sin, and eternal Life, or Death, both rich and poor are alike. This difference is only as to the pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. Is that nothing to you? you speak against your own, and all mens sense: we see how highly men esteem to be freed from a painful, though short, disease here; how much more to be freed from such pains as you all confess to be unspeakably more sharp and grievous than all the pains that ever were endured in this world: It is so considerable a thing, that I assure you, it is to me matter of wonder (if Christ and the Apostles had been of your minde) how it came to pass so unluckily, that the poor only should receive the Gospel; whereas, if the men of that Age had not been all Fools, the rich would have been most forward to entertain it.

VII. But to proceed. My seventh Consideration against your Religion is taken from its great hazzard, and utter uncertainty. According to the doctrine of your Church, no man can be sure of his salva-

tion

tion (without a revelation) but he must go out of the world, not knowing whether he goes. Indeed there is nothing but hazzard and uncertainty in your Religion; I suppose you grant that all your Faith, and consequently your salvation depends upon the infallible Authority of your Church.

Pop. *That is most certain.*

Prot. Are you then infallibly certain, that your Church is infallible, or do you only probably believe it?

Pop. *I am but a private Priest, and therefore cannot pretend to Infallibility; but I am fully satisfied in it, that the Church is infallible in it self.*

Prot. Then I see you pretend to no more certainty than I have; for I know (and you grant) that the Scripture is infallible in it self: and I know its infallibility as certainly as you know the infallibility of your Church. But, I pray you tell me, what is your opinion? I know you are divided: but where do you place the infallibility, or where do you lay the foundation of your Faith?

Pop. *To deal freely with you, I place it in the Pope; who when he determines things* out of his Chair, *is infallible: for S.* Peter *who was supream Head of the Church, left the Pope his Successour.*

Prot.

Prot. Then it seems your Faith doth wholly depend on these things, that Saint *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, and died there, and that he left the Pope his successor in his supream and infallible Authority.

Pop. *It doth so.*

Prot. How then are you infallibly assured of the truth of these things, which are all matters of Fact?

Pop. *Because they are affirmed by so many of the Ancient Fathers and Writers.*

Prot. Were those Fathers or Writers infallible persons?

Pop. *No.*

Prot. Then might they, and so may you, be mistaken in that point; and so indeed you have nothing but a meer conjecture for the foundation of your Faith. But again, are you infallibly sure, that Saint *Peters* intention was to leave his Infallibility to the Pope? For I do not read that S. *Peter* left it in his last will. I tell you true it is strange to me, that St. *Peter* should write two Catholick Epistles, and (as I observed before) not leave one word concerning this matter. For my part I shall alwayes rather question the Popes Authority, than S. *Peters* fidelity or discretion, in omitting so Fundamental a Point when he put in many of far less concernment. But

fur-

further, I demand, How are you assured that St. *Peter* intended to leave his power, and did actually leave it to his Successors?

Pop. *By the unanimous consent of the Ancient Fathers.*

Prot. I wonder at your confidence, that you dare affirm a thing which our Authors * have so clearly proved to be false. But suppose it were so, that the Fathers had said it; tell me, are the Fathers infallible? at least are they so in their reports of matter of Fact?

Pop. *Now we confess that it is only the Pope or Council that are infallible, not the Fathers; and to be true to you, even the Pope himself is not infallible in his Reports of Matters of Fact.*

Prot. Then you have nothing but a meer conjecture, or historical Report delivered by men, liable to mistake, for the great foundation of your Faith. Yet once more, have you any greater or better certainty for your Faith than the Pope himself.

Pop. *God forbid I should be so impudent or wicked to say so; for my Faith depends upon his certainty.*

Prot. Very well, How I beseech you is the Pope assured? what is it that makes him infallibly certain of his own Infallibility? Is he assured of it by Revelation?

* *Moulin, Reinolds* against *Hart*, and others.

Pop.

Pop. *No, (as I have told you oft) we pretend to no such things.*

Prot. How then?

Pop. *By the Spirit of God which guides him into all truth.*

Prot. How is he assured that the Spirit of God guides him?

Pop. *By the promises God hath made to him; I need not repeat them, they are known already,* Thou art Peter, *&c.* Simon, Simon, I have prayed that thy Faith fail not, *&c.*

Prot. I have already shewn how absurdly these Texts are alledged. But I beseech you, how is the Pope infallibly assured that this is the true meaning of those Texts? You confess it is not by inspiration.

Pop. *He knows that by considering and comparing Scripture with Scripture, and by consulting the Fathers, and Prayer, Diligence, and Obedience, &c.*

Prot. All these things are very good, but any other man may use these means as well as the Pope, and hath as full promises from God, as any the Pope pretends to, as *Joh.* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God*; and the Spirit of Truth is promised to all that ask it, *Luke* 11. 13. So if this be all you

have

have to say, God deliver my soul from such a desperate Religion wherein all the certainty of its Faith depends upon his infallibility that is not certain of his own infallibility.

But I need say no more of this; It is to me an undeniable argument, that there is no certainty at all in this foundation; because (as you confess) so many hundreds of your ablest Schollars do utterly reject it. But once more, in my opinion you run a dreadful hazzard in the point of worshiping of Creatures, Images, Saints, and especially the Bread in the Sacrament, in which you run other hazards besides those I spoke of. I am told, that your Doctrine is this, That it is necessary to the making of a Sacrament (and so to the conversion of the Bread into Christs Body) that the Priest intend to consecrate it. Is it so?

Pop. *Yes doubtless*, Bellarmin *and all our Authors largely dispute for that.*

Prot. And can I be sure of another mans intentions? It is sufficiently known, that divers of your Priests are prophane, and atheistical wretches, others envious and malicious, and some actually Jews. What assurance have I, that my Priest is not such an one, and that he doth not either out of a contempt or hatred of Religion

ligion or malice againſt my perſon, intend to deceive me, and not make a Sacrament of it? Sure I am, they intend to deceive their people in the preaching of the Word, and why they may not do ſo in the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament, I know not.

VIII. My eighth and laſt general conſideration is this, that your Religion deſtroys even the principles of morality: which true Religion is ſo far from deſtroying, that it improves and perfects it. I confeſs, the bloodineſs of your Religion hath ever made me both ſuſpect and loath it. I finde that Chriſt is a Prince of peace; that though he whipt ſome out of the Temple, yet he never whipt any into his Church; that he drew in his Diſciples with the cords of a man, of conviction and perſwaſion; and ſo did his Apoſtles after him: but your Religion (like *Draco's* laws) is written in blood. I perceive you anſwer our Arguments with Fire and Faggot: beſides this, your Religion deſtroyes all civil Faith and Society; your principle is known, and ſo is your practice of equivocation, and keeping no faith with Hereticks.

Pop. *I know where you are, you mean becauſe of* John Huſſe, *who after he had the faith*

faith of the Emperour given him for his safe Conduct, was contrary to that faith put to death in the Council of Constance.

Prot. I do so, and what can you say for it?

Pop. *This I say you must not charge upon our Church, the opinion of some few private Doctors, since others disown this, and have written against it.*

Prot. It seems it is a disputable point among you, whether you ought to be honest or not: but I have heard that *John Husse* was condemned by the Council of *Constance*, and that when the Emperour scrupled to break his Faith, they declared he might do it, and ought to do it. Is it so?

Pop. *It is true, what was done in that point, was done by the Council.*

Prot. And you hold Councils (especially where the Pope joyns with them as he did with that Council) to be infallible; and therefore this I may confidently charge upon you as a Principle of your Religion. I cannot but observe your fine devices: At other times when we alledge passages out of any of your learned Doctors which make against you, you tell us they are but private Doctors, and we must judge of you by your Councils. Now here

here we bring an approved Councils testimony, and you send us back to your private Doctors.

Pop. *These discourses of yours are onely general; I had rather you would come to the other thing you proposed, viz. to examine the particular points of our Religion, wherein I hope I shall give you such solid grounds and reasons, that when you shall understand them, you will embrace them.*

Prot. You shall find me ingenuous and docible, only remember I expect not words, but solid Arguments. I think our best course will be to pick out some principal points of your Religion, and examine them; for the rest will either stand or fall as they do.

Pop. *I am perfectly of your mind, let us proceed accordingly.*

Prot. First then, if you please, we will begin with the sacrifice of the Mass, which you say is essential to the Christian Religion.

Pop. *It is so, and* Bellarmine *rightly saith, that* where there is no sacrifice *(as you Protestants have none)* there is in truth no Religion.

Prot. Therefore, I pray you, let me hear one or two (for those are as good as an hundred) of your chief grounds and reasons for that Sacrifice.

Pop.

Pop. *I approve your motion, and I shall only insist upon two Arguments: First, the Sacrifice of the Mass was appointed by God, or Christ in the words of Institution of the Sacrament,* do this in remembrance of me. *It is the great Argument of the Council of* Trent *.

Prot. I adore the fruitfulness of your Churches Invention. It seems they think these two words, *do this*, contain no less than two of your Sacraments, to wit, that of *Orders*, which makes Priests, and that of the *Supper*.

Pop. *They do so.*

Prot. That no sober man will easily believe; nor that Christs meaning in the words mentioned was this, *Sacrifice me in remembrance of me.* But let me hear how you prove the Institution of the Mass from these words.

Pop. *Christ bid his Disciples,* do this, *viz. that which he did: Christ did in that last Supper truly and properly offer up himself to his Father, his Body under the shape of Bread, his Blood under the shape of Wine; and therefore they were truly and properly to offer up, or*

* *Sess. 22. cap. 9. Can. 2, 3.*

Sacrifice Christ is the Sacrament. The Argument is Bellarmins *.

Prot. How do you prove that Christ did in that last Supper truly and properly offer up his Body and Blood to his Father? I read that *Christ offered himself but once*, Heb. 8. 27. and 9. 25, 26, 27, 28. and 10. 14. and that was upon the Cross; nor do I find that he offered any thing at all to God in that Supper, but only to his Apostles: And what, did Christ Sacrifice himself, and imbrue his hands in his own Blood? and did he eat up his own Body? did he take his whole Body into his Mouth? these are Monsters of Opinions: But how prove you that Christ did then offer up himself to God?

Pop. *Because Christ speaks in the present tense*, This is my Body which is broken, Blood which is shed: *he doth not say which* shall be *broken, and shed; and therefore it must be broken and shed at that very time.*

Prot. What a vain Argument is this? you know nothing is more usual in Scripture than to put the Present Tense for the Future. And it is so put in this very matter, Christ saith, *I do lay down my life*, when he means, I will do it shortly, *John*

* *De Missâ*, l. 1. c. 12. *Sextum.*

10. 15. *I do go to my Father,* John 16. 28. that is, I shall go shortly: *Do that thou dost,* that is, *art about to do,* John 13. 27. And in *Mat.* 26. Christ saith of his Blood, *This is my Blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins;* and yet I suppose it was not shed at that time; for you all profess the Sacrifice of the Mass is an unbloody Sacrifice: But again, tell me, I pray you, when Christ said, *do this,* did they not obey Christs command at that Supper?

Pop. *I cannot deny that.*

Prot. Thence unavoidably follows, that this *doing* concerns the Communicants, as well as (if not more than) the Minister; and so it is not meant of Sacrificing Christ, but receiving of him; and really, if this Text do not, there is no other which doth, enjoyn Communicants to receive; which he that can believe, hath got a good mastery over his Faith: Besides, what Christ here commands his Apostles, I finde St. *Paul* commands the Corinthians, and expounds *doing this* by *eating and drinking*, 1 Cor. 11. And moreover, if the words *do this*, were the words which did ordain both *Priest* and *Sacrifice*, who can think that two of the Evangelists, *viz.* both *Matthew* and *Mark* would have omitted them in mentioning the words of

In-

Institution: and therefore this may pass. I shall only adde, that if our Divines should prove their Doctrines no better than by such wrested Scriptures and Arguments as this, we should hiss them out of the Pulpit: but I suppose you have some better Argument, therefore let me hear it.

Pop. *Consider then that irresistable Argument*, Christ is a Priest, after the order of Melchisedeck. *Now* Melchisedeck *did offer up a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine to God*, Gen. 14. *and therefore Christ was bound in agreement with this Type, to offer up such a Sacrifice, even his Body and Blood, under the species of Bread and Wine.*

Prot. You tell me *Melchisedeck* offered up Bread and Wine to God; I finde no such matter: it is only a dream of your own. The History is, *Gen.* 14. where indeed I read of his offering Bread and Wine to *Abraham* and his Souldiers, to refresh them (according to the custom of those times and places,) *Deut.* 23. 3, 4. and *Judges* 8. 6. but not a word of any offering to God. It is the strangest relation of a Sacrifice that ever was; here's not one word of the *Altar*, or *Offering*, or *Consecration*, or the *Destruction* of the Sacrifice. You grant the thing sacrificed must be destroyed

stroyed when it is sacrificed; I pray you, how is this bread destroyed (save onely by the Souldiers mouths, which you say came after the Sacrifice?)

Pop. *The bread possibly was destroyed by putting it in the furnace, and the Wine sprinkled upon the furnace, as* Vasquez *answers* *.

Prot. I see it was otherwise in those dayes than now it is. If I thought my Bread would be destroyed by putting it into the Oven, I assure you, I would never put it in.

Pop. *It must be a Sacrifice that is there related; for it follows,* And he was the Priest of the most High God.

Prot. Not at all; for his being Priest evidently relates to that which follows, *and he blessed him, and received Tythes of all:* Besides, if *Melchisedeck* did here offer a Sacrifice, was Jesus Christ obliged to offer the same kind of Sacrifice that he did? for Christ was to offer up himself, *Heb.* 9.10. (which none of his Types did.) Tell me first, Was *Melchisedeck* a Type of Christ in that action of eating Bread and Wine?

(*) *In Part.* 3. *Thomæ tom.* 3. *q.* 83. *dis.* 220. *art.* 1. c. 3.

Pop.

Pop. *Yes doubtless, and this was the principal thing, in respect of which Christ is called a Priest after the order of* Melchisedeck, *or else I say nothing.*

Prot. Then tell me, how can any man in his wits, believe that St. *Paul*, who spends so much of his Epistle to the *Hebrews*; in comparing *Christ* and *Melchisedeck*, and their Priesthood together; and who picks up the very smallest circumstances, as that he was *without father*, &c. Should not speak one word of this, which (if you say true) was the principal thing? Besides all this, If *Melchisedeck* was a type of Christ in that action, Did Christ offer Bread and Wine as *Melchisedeck* did?

Pop. *No, but he offered his own Body and Bloud under the appearance of Bread and Wine.*

Prot. Nay, now I see there is no possibility of pleasing you: for I expected this all along, that Christ must needs have offered the same kind of Sacrifice that *Melchisedeck* did here: But now you forsake your own argument, and because *Melchisedeck* did offer Bread and Wine, Christ must not offer Bread and Wine, but something else under those appearances. Now I have heard your two principal Arguments, I hope you will hear mine also.

Pop

Pop. *Good reason I should do so.*

Prot. Then first, I argue thus, The Sacrifice of Christ was perfect, and did perfect all Believers, *Heb.* 10. 14. and therefore it need not, and ought not to be repeated, for the Apostle proves the imperfection of Levitical Sacrifices, because they were repeated, *Heb.* 10. 1, 2. *Where remission of sin is, there is no more offering for sin,* Heb. 10. 18. Either then remission was not obtained by his once offering, or there must be no more offering; either Christs offering upon the Cross was insufficient, or yours in the Mass is unnecessary.

Pop. *It is not properly repeated, for it is the same Sacrifice for substance, which was offered upon the Cross, and is offered in the Mass* *.

Prot. How is it of the same kind, when you say, the one is bloody, the other unbloody; the one offered by Christ, the other by a Priest; but if it were of the same kind, so were the Levitical Sacrifices, and all had relation to Christ (as you pretend all Masses have) and yet the Apostle makes their Repetition an evidence of their Imperfection, *Heb.*

* *Cornelius à Lapide in* Heb. 7. 28.

9. 10. And moreover, the Apostle denies not only the repetition of other Sacrifices, but also of the same Sacrifice, and tells us as plainly (as man can speak) that Christ was to offer up himself but once, *Heb.* 9. 25. *&c.* whereas you will needs over-rule the Apostle, and force Christ to offer up himself thousands of times.

Pop. *It is true, there is but one Sacrifice of Redemption, and Expiation for Sin, and that was the Sacrifice of the Cross; but there are other Sacrifices of Application to apply that to us.*

Prot. I hope the Word, and Sacraments, and Spirit of Christ, are sufficient to apply Christs Sacrifice; must we have one Sacrifice to apply another? who ever heard of one plaister made to apply another? or a ransome paid the second time to apply the former payment? And you seem to me quite to forget your selves, to destroy the nature of your Sacrifice: for the business of a Sacrifice is oblation to God, not application to men. Besides, I have one Argument more which fully satisfies me; if the Mass be a real and proper Sacrifice, then the thing sacrificed must be really and properly destroyed?

Pop. *That I readyly grant, as* Bellarmin

min(a) *also doth, and indeed so it was in all the Sacrifices that ever were offered to God.*

Prot. But surely Jesus Christ is not destroyed in the Mass: Is he? And are your Priests the murderers of Christ?

Pop. *He is not so destroyed, for we tell you, it is an unbloody Sacrifice; yet he is in a manner destroy'd by the Priest's eating of him: for thereby Christ ceaseth to be where he was before, that is, in the species of Bread and Wine, and the Bread and Wine are destroyed.*

Prot. Call you this a destruction, for one to remove from one place to another, or to cease to be where he was before? this is ridiculous; and yet this (b) fantastical and mock-destruction is all which you can bring, instead of that real destruction, which you confess necessary to the very essence of a Sacrifice. And as for the Bread and Wine they were destroyed by Transubstantiation, not by the Oblation or Sacrifice which comes after it.

And now having mentioned that, let us discourse concerning your Doctrine of

---

(a) *Sacrificium verum & reale veram & realem occisionem exigit.* Bell. de Missa, l. 1. c. 27. *Denique vel in Missa.* (b) *Ibid.*

Transubstantiation. And first, tell me what is the Doctrine of your Church?

Pop. *That the Council of* Trent *will inform you, which declareth*, that by Consecration the whole substance of the Bread and Wine is converted into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ (*a.*)

Prot. How is it possible for the Bread to be converted into Christs Body, which was made already before the Bread? That Christ could turn Water into Wine was possible, but that he should turn that Water into such Wine as was in being before that change, this is impossible: but let that go: My next question is, if a Christian did actually receive Christs Body and Blood, tell me, what profit hath he by it? I cannot believe that God would work so many Miracles (as you affirm he doth in this Sacrament) to no purpose: Scripture and Reason tells me, and your Council of *Trent* confesseth (*b*), that the Sacrament is a feast for my Soul, and not for my Body. Is it not so? Now, what is my Soul the better for eating the very Body of Christ? When the woman cryed out to our Saviour, (*c*) *Blessed is the womb that*

(*a*) *Sess.* 13. *de Eucharist. cap.* 4. (*b*) *Sess.* 13. *cap.* 2. (*c*) Luk. 11. 27, 28.

bare

bare thee; Christ replies, *Yea, rather, Blessed are they that hear Gods Word, and do it:* nevertheless, if you can solidly prove it, I will receive it; therefore bring forth your Principal Arguments for it.

Pop. *I will do so, and our Church proves this point, especially from two places of Scripture,* John 6. *and the words of Institution. I begin with the sixth Chapter of* John, *where our Saviour oft tells us, that* the Bread which he gives is his flesh, *&c.*

Prot. I have heard, that divers of your learned Doctors confess this Chapter speaks not of the Sacrament: Is it so?

Pop. *I will not dissemble with you. That was the opinion of* Biel *(a), Cardinal* Cusanus *(b),* Cajetan *(c), and* Tapperus *(d), and divers others.*

Prot. Certainly, This Argument is not likely to convince a Protestant which could not satisfie your own ablest Scholars. But I will not press that farther. Tell me then, do you judge that Christ speaks here of a bodily eating and drinking of his very Flesh and Blood?

Pop. *We do so.*

Prot. I confess some of the Antients

(a) In Canone Missæ. (b) Ep. 7. ad Bohemos. (c) In Aquin. par. 3. qu. 80. art. 8. (d) Artic. Lovan. 15.

were of your minde, I mean the Jews. But with submission, I am rather of Christs Opinion, who plainly destroys that gross and carnal sense, telling them, it is the *Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profits nothing*, ver. 63. Again, doth not Christ press this as a necessary, and present duty, upon all the Jews that then heard him?

Pop. *That must be granted.*

Prot. Then certainly Christ speaks not of the Sacrament which was not then instituted, and therefore they could not partake of it. I demand further, is this Sacrament of such efficacy, that all that receive it are saved; and of such necessity, that all that do not take it are damned?

Pop. *No, our Church utterly condemns both those Opinions.*

Prot. But this eating of Christs Flesh is such, that Christ saith, all that eat it are saved, *ver.* 54. and all that do not eat it are damned, *v.* 53. Therefore surely he speaks not of a Sacramental eating: besides the whole Laity are utterly undone, if your sense of this Chapter be true; for I finde that drinking of Christs Blood is no less necessary to life eternal, than eating of his Flesh; and therefore woe to them to whom you do not allow to drink of the Cup in the Sacrament. I am told this objection

jection is so considerable, that it forced divers of your Doctors (sore against their will) to forsake this Argument; and therefore this will not do your work: but I presume you have better Arguments.

Pop. *We have so. I shall urge but one, which is of its self sufficient, from the plain words of Institution,* This is my Body. *Methinks the very hearing of them read, shou'd convince you, if you wou'd take the words in their plain and proper sense, and not devise I know not what Figures and Tropes.*

Prot. If it were true that Christ did turn the Bread into his Body by saying these words, *This is my Body*, yet how doth it follow, that the priest by reciting these words, worketh the same effect, any more than a Priest, every time he reads those words, *Let there be light*, doth make light; because God did make it by those words: or than he raiseth a dead man, every time he reads those words of Christ, *Lazarus, come forth.* Moreover, I have heard that divers of your most learned Doctors confess, that this place doth not, nor indeed, any other place of Scripture, prove Transubstantiation. I have heard three Cardinals named, *viz. Cajetan* (*a*) and our Bi-

(*a*) *In* 3. *Thomæ qu.* 75. *art.* 1.

shop of *Rochester* (*b*) and *Cameracensis* (*c*) and divers famous Schoolmen, as *Scotus* and *Biel*, of whom this is known, and *Durandus* (*d*), and *Ocham* (*e*), and *Melchior Canus* (*f*), and *Vasquez* (*g*), and the great Cardinal *Perron* professeth, that *he believes Transubstantiation, not by vertue of any necessary consequence, or reason, alledged by their Doctors; but by the words of Christ, as they are expounded by Tradition* (*h*): and *Bellarmin* himself confesseth, *This opinion is not improbable* (*i*). Methinks so many learned mens forsaking this Argument (who doubtless would have been right glad if it had been solid, and imployed all their wits to search out the strength of it) is to me a convincing evidence of its weakness and vanity, as also of the badness of your Cause, that can finde no better Argument; yet I am willing to hear what you can say.

Pop. *This then I say, that these words,* This is my Body, *are to be taken in their proper, and not in a figurative sense: for surely Christ would speak plainly to the understanding of his Disciples, especially when*

(*b*) *Contra Captiv. Babyl. cap.* 10. (*c*) *In* 4. *Sentent. qu.* 6. *lit. f.* (*d*) *In* 4 *Distinc.* 11. *q.* 4. *art.* 14. (*e*) *In* 4 *q* 6. (*f*) *Loc. com. l.* 3. *c.*3. (*g*) *Tom* 3. *in* 3. *dis.* 180. *c.* 5. (*h*) *Traitté p.* 793. (*i*) *De Euchar. l.* 3. *c.* 23.

he

he was so near his Death, and making his last Will and Testament, and instituting the Sacrament; in such cases men use to speak plainly.

Prot. I readily grant that Christ did speak plainly and intelligibly: But tell me, is not that plain enough, when we take the words as they are commonly used in Scripture?

Pop. *I must needs grant that; but this is not the Present case.*

Prot. But it is; for we can give you scores of instances, as you very well know where the word *Is*, is so taken: nor is any thing more frequent in Scripture, *the seven kine*, and so *the seven ears of corn, are seven years*, Gen. 4. 12, 18. the *Stars are the Angels of the Churches*, Rev. 1. 20. the *seven heads are seven Mountains*, Rev. 17. 9. So Christ saith, *I AM the way, the door, &c.* So *Zach.* 5. 7,8. *This woman* is *wickedness*; and a thousand such expressions. How do you understand these places?

Pop. *The sense is plain, they* signifie *those things; the Stars* signifie *the Angels, and so for the rest.*

Prot. Then certainly we have the advantage of you, in this point, for we take *is* for *signifies*, (as you confess it is commonly taken) nor have the Jews (as I have been assured by learned men) any proper

word for *signifie* (as the *Greeks* and *Latines* have) but generally expreſs it in this manner: But you muſt take it (if the Particle *this* denote the Bread, as I ſhall plainly prove it doth) for *is converted into*; a ſenſe which you cannot give one example of in all Scripture. I ſee it was not without reaſon that you took the interpretation of Scripture into the Churches hands; for if you had left it in Gods hands, and left one Scripture to do that friendly office to expound another, you had certainly loſt an Article of your Faith: And whereas you ſay that Chriſt would ſpeak ſo as the Diſciples might underſtand him, that ſufficiently ſhews, that yours is not the true ſenſe; for they could never have underſtood it, and would doubtleſs have been as much puzzled *then*, as all the World *now* is, to apprehend that the body of Chriſt was contained under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine, inviſibly and undiſcoverably, after the manner of a Spirit, to conceive of a body without bigneſs, long without length, broad without breadth, broken whileſt it remains whole (all which you profeſs to believe.) This is to turn Chriſts plain ſpeech into a bundle of Riddles; and to call this the plain ſenſe of the words which is (as you ſee) a heap of Figures,

is

is a greater figure than all the rest; but they did well enough understand the words in our sense, because they were well read in Scripture, wherein, as you grant, that sense of the words is usual.

Pop. *If we grant it is used so in other cases, yet not in Sacramental Texts, for there Christ would speak properly.*

Prot. Yes, It is usual even in the Sacraments; Is not Circumcision called the Covenant? *This is my Covenant*, Gen. 17. 10. though properly it was not the Covenant, but the Seal of it, *Rom.* 4. 11. *Is not the Lamb called the Lords Passover? Exod.* 12. though all men knew it was not *the Lamb*, nor the Ceremony of eating it, which was or could be properly the Lords passing over the houses of the *Israelites*; thus 1 *Cor.* 10. *The Rock (that followed the Israelites) is Christ*, though it was so only Figuratively and Sacramentally. Moreover, I am told, that divers of your own brethren acknowledge figures here. *Tapperus* saith, *It is not inconvenient to admit of Tropes here, provided they be such as do not exclude the true presence of Christs Body* (*a*). And that the Bishop of *Evreux* owns three Figures in the words of this Sacrament (*b*); and

(*a*) *Artic. Lovan.* 13. (*b*) *Repet.* 3. c. 3.

that

hat *Suarez* (*c*), *Bellarmine* (*d*), and divers others confess as much.

Pop. *It is true, they do say so.*

Prot. Besides, you cannot think strange, if there be Figures in the first part, *This is my Body*, since it is most apparent there are Figures in the last part, *This is the New Testament in my bloud.* Here are not one, but divers Figures in it. The *Cup* you grant is taken for the liquor in it, there is one figure: The Wine in the Cup is taken for the Bloud, which was not in the Cup; that is a strange figure indeed (Logicians call it *Non-sense.*) This Cup, or Wine, or Bloud (if you please) is the New Testament or Covenant; whereas it was only the Seal of the New Testament, as is most manifest, because it is called, *The Bloud of the New Testament, and the New Testament in my Bloud.* Besides other strange figures, which I shall have occasion to speak to by and by. Here is figure upon figure, and yet you have the impudence to reproach us for putting in but one figure, which you confess to be very frequent. Wonder O

(*c*) *In Tom.* 3. *dis.* 60. *sect.* 2. (*d*) *De Eucharistia, l.* 1, *c.* 11.

Heavens,

Heavens, and judge O Earth, whether these men do not strain at Gnats, and swallow Camels! And nothing doth more confirm the truth in this point, than to consider into what absurdities this Doctrine hath forced you, even to say, that *the Bloud of Christ is properly the Covenant or Testament* * : And that there are *two sorts of Christs Bloud, the one in the Cup, the other shed on the Cross (a)*: *And that the Bloud of Christ is shed in the Sacrament*, and yet never stirreth out of the veins: Did ever God or man speak of such bloud-shed? therefore for shame never charge us with understanding this Text figuratively. But again, let me ask you, Will you affirm that these words, *This is my body*, are to be taken properly? Doth your Church understand them so?

Pop. *Yes surely, or else we do ill to reproach you for taking them improperly.*

Prot. The words are not true in a proper sense, nor indeed do you understand them so.

Pop. *Make that good, and I must give up this cause for ever.*

Prot. First, for the word *this*, it is most

(*) *Bel. de Euch. l. 1. c. 11.* (a) *De Euch. l. 1. c. 11. Ad quartam dico.*

evident

evident that it is meant of Bread: It is impossible for words to express any thing more plainly, than that by *this*, is meant the Bread. It is said expressly, that *Christ took Bread and brake it, and gave it, and said, Take, eat,* THIS *is my Body.* Where *this* necessarily relates to that which Christ, took, and brake, and gave. After Christ came the Apostles, and particularly Saint *Paul*, and he expounds the mind of Christ (and I hope you do not think he was so bad an expositor, that his Comment was harder than the Text) and he tells us thrice in a breath that it is Bread, 1 Cor. 11. 26. *As oft as you eat this Bread*, and *whosoever shall eat this Bread*, and *so let him eat of that Bread.* And again, 1 Cor. 10. 16. *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* And the participation of the Sacrament is called, *breaking of Bread*, Acts 2. 46. & 20. 7. which your Authors understand of the Sacrament: and besides *this*, whatever it is, is broken, as it follows; but you dare not say, Christs Body is broken. Now then, since it is most evident, that this is meant of the Bread, I hope, you will not say, this is properly Christs Body.

Pop.

Pop. *No: We are not so absurd to say, this Bread is Christs body, for that is false and against common sense as* Bellarmine *well saith* *

Prot. What then do you mean by the word *this*?

Pop. *By* This, *I understand neither the Bread nor Christs Body, but in general this substance which is contained under this species* †.

Prot. What do you mean by that? I pray you tell me, Do you believe that there are any more substances under those species, besides the Bread first, and afterward the Body of Christ? Do not you profess, that as soon as ever it ceaseth to be Bread, it becomes the Body of Christ?

Pop. *We do so.*

Prot. Then surely if it be a substance, according to you, it must be either Bread, or the Body of Christ; but you allow it to be neither, and therefore it is no substance at all. In the next place, for the word *is*, I have shewed, you do not understand that properly neither: but for the word *Body* also, do you understand that properly?

(*) *De Eucharist*, l. 3. c. 19. (†) *Bellarm. de Eucharist.* l. 3. c. 19.

Pop.

Pop. *Yes without doubt.*

Prot. I am told that your Church professeth to believe that Christs body is there after the manner of a spirit, taking up no room; that head, hands, feet, are altogether in the least crumb of the Host. Is this true?

Pop. *Yes, we all agree in that.*

Prot. Then sure I am, the word *Body* is most improperly taken: A learned man well observes, that *you plead for the propriety of words, and destroy the propriety of things*; * How can you say that it is properly a body, which wants the essential property of a body; which is, to have quantity and take up room: Take away this, and the body may be properly a spirit; for it is *that* only which differenceth it from a spirit: So now I see you neither do, nor can understand these words properly; and upon the whole matter that this Doctrine is false, and your Proofs most weak and frivolous, you shall see that I have better arguments against your Doctrine than you have for it.

Pop. *I pray you let me hear them, but be brief in them.*

---

* *Place de la messe.*

Prot.

Prot. I have only three Arguments, your Doctrine is againſt Senſe, againſt Reaſon, and againſt Scripture.

Pop. *Let me ſee how you will make theſe things good.*

Prot. For the firſt I ask you, if I am as ſure that your Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is falſe, as you are ſure that the Chriſtian Religion is true; will you deſire more evidence?

Pop. *If I ſhould, I were an unreaſonable perſon.*

Prot. And have you any greater aſſurance now of the truth of the Chriſtian Religion, than you could have had, if you had lived in Chriſts dayes?

Pop. *That were impudence to affirm: but what do you mean?*

Prot. If you had lived *then*, what greater evidence could you have had of it, than what your ſenſes afforded; for ſince the great Argument for Chriſtianity (as all agree) was the words that Chriſt ſpake and the works that Chriſt did; how could you be ſure that he did ſo ſpeak, or ſo work, if you may not credit the reports of your eyes and ears? This was S. *Lukes* great evidence of the truth of what he writes, that *it was delivered to him by eye-witneſſes*, S. Luke 1. 1, 2. and St. Johns, *what*

what we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled of the word of life: 1 John 1. And St. *Paul* for Christs Resurrection, that *he was seen of* Cephas, *then of the twelve, then of the* 500, 1 Cor. 15. 5, 6. Even *Thomas* his Infidelity yielded to this argument, that if *he did thrust his hand into Christs side he would believe*, John 20. 25. Christ judged this a convincing argument, when the Apostles thought he had been a Spirit, *handle me and see for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones*, as you see me have, *Luke* 24. 39. Are these things true?

Pop. *I cannot deny it, they are not yours, but Scripture assertions.*

Prot. And do not all my senses tell me that this is Bread?

Pop. *I must grant that, but your senses deceived.*

Prot. Then your senses also might have been deceived about the words and works of Christ, and so the greatest evidence of Christian Religion is lost: but for my part it makes me abhor your Religion; that so you may but seem to defend your own opinions, you care not if you shake the pillars of Christianity: My second Argument is, that your Doctrine of Transubstantiation is against reason. Tell me I pray you, do you think any of the Arti-

cles

cles of Christian Religion are contrary to reason?

Pop. *No, they may be above reason, but God forbid I should be so injurious to Christianity to say any of them are against reason.*

Prot. But your doctrine is as much against reason as sense, for it makes you believe things absolutely impossible, and gross contradictions.

Pop. *You may imagine many things impossible that really are not so: but if you can prove any real impossibilities which this doctrine forceth us to believe I must yield, for we joyn with you in condemning the Lutheran opinion that Christs Body is every where, because it is an impossibility, and we therefore expound those words,* I am the Vine, I am a door, *&c. figuratively, because it is impossible for him who is a man, to be a vine, or a door.* *

Prot. And it is no less impossible for the Bread to be Christs Body: Why might not the Vine, (as well as the Wine) be by Transubstantiation, converted into Christs Substance? I think the Mother is as good as the Daughter, and especially since Christ saith, *I am the true Vine*, you might as well have devised another tran-

* A Popish Book, called, *Scripture mistaken. p.* 276.

substan-

ſubſtantiation to make Chriſts words good, I know what work you would have made of it, if he had ſaid, *This is my TRUE Body, or my TRUE Blood.*

But to give that over; I will ſhew you, that there is ſuch an heap of contradictions, as never met together, in the moſt abſurd opinion that ever was in the world: I profeſs (when I ſet my wit at work) I cannot deviſe greater abſurdities than you believe. Tell me, do you hold that the whole Body of Chriſt is preſent in every crumb of the Bread, and in every drop of the Wine?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs, Chriſt is there entire, and undivided.*

Prot. I ſuppoſe you believe that Chriſts Body is in Heaven, in ſuch a proportion, or bigneſs, as he had upon Earth.

Pop. *No doubt of that.*

Prot. Then the ſame Body of Chriſt is bigger than it ſelf, and longer than its ſelf, and which is yet worſe, Chriſt is divided from himſelf. I know not what can be more impoſſible, than to ſay, that all Chriſt is at *Rome*, and all at *London*, and all in Heaven, and yet not in the places between.

Pop. *All this is by Gods Almighty Power.*

Prot

Prot. Then I ſuppoſe, by the ſame Almighty Power, it is poſſible for any other man to be in ſo many places; for it matters not that Chriſt be inviſibly in ſo many places, and another ſhould be there viſibly, or that Chriſt is there in ſo little a bulk, and another muſt be in a greater.

Pop. *I muſt needs grant that, and I affirm it is not abſolutely impoſſible for any other man to be at ſeveral places at once by Gods Power.*

Prot. Then mark what monſters follow from this: ſuppoſe now *John* to be by divine Power at the ſame time at *Rome*, at *Paris*, and at *London*; where ever *John* is alive, I ſuppoſe, he hath a power to move himſelf.

Pop. *That muſt needs be, elſe he were not a living Creature.*

Prot. Then *John* at *Rome* may walk towards *London*, and *John* at *London* may walk towards *Rome*, and ſo they may meet (ſhall I ſay, *one the other ?*) and you may be ſure it will be a merry meeting: It were worth enquiry, how long they will be e're they come together. Then again, at *Rome* all the parts of *John* may be exceſſively hot, and at *London* exceſſively cold, and at *Paris* neither hot nor cold: This is beyond all the Romances that ever were deviſed.

devised. Besides, *John* may be sorely wounded at *Rome*, and yet at *London* he may sleep in a whole skin; *John* may be feasting at *Rome*, and fasting at *London* in the same moment. I might be infinite in reckoning the horrid absurdities of this Doctrine; he that can believe these things, will stick at nothing.

Pop. *You talk at this rate, because you measure God by your selves, whereas he can do more than you or I can do.*

Prot. There are some things which it is no dishonor to God, to say he cannot do them, because they are either sinful (so God cannot lie) or absolutely impossible; God himself cannot make a man to be alive and dead at the same time: God cannot make the whole to be less than a part of it: he cannot make three to be more than threescore: he cannot make a Son to beget his Father: he cannot make the same man to be born at two several times (as your Authors confess); and therefore in like manner he cannot make the same body to be in two several places; for this is not one jot less impossible than the other.

Pop. *These indeed are great difficulties to humane reason, but reason is not to be believed against Scripture.*

Prot.

Prot. True, but this is your hard hap; this Doctrine of yours is against Scripture as well as Reason, and indeed against many Articles of Religion.

And first, it is against the Scripture, in as much as it is highly dishonourable to Christ, whose honour is the great design of the Scripture. What a foul dishonour is it to him to subject him to the will of every Mass Priest, who, when he pleaseth, can command him down into the Bread? What a dishonour is it, *that the very Body of Christ may be eaten by Rats or Worms, and may be cast up by Vomit*, and the like, as your *Aquinas* affirms (*a*). And that your Church in her *Missals* hath put this amongst other directions, that if *worms or Rats have eaten Christ Body, they must be burned; and if any man vomit it up, it must be eaten again, or burned, or made a Relick*; (*b*) and yet this is no more than your Doctrine will force you to own: for if you will believe Christs words, in one place as well as in another, he assureth us, that *whatsoever* (without exception) *entreth into the mouth, goeth into the belly, and is cast forth into the draught*, Matth. 15. 17.

(*a*) *Sum. qu.* 80. *art.* 3. (*b*) *Can.* 39. *Glossa in Can.* c. 2. *De Consecratione.*

Pop.

Pop. *This is no more dishonourable to Christ than that the Fleas might suck his Blood when he was upon earth.*

Prot. You mistake woefully; for though in the dayes of his flesh, it was no dishonor to him (and it was necessary for us) that he suffered so many indignities, and died, and was crucified, yet now, that he is risen from the dead, *he dies no more*, Rom. 6. and it is a dishonour to him to be crucified again, and to be brought back to those reproaches which he long since left; and all this to no purpose, and without any profit to us, (as I shewed.) Again, the Scripture approveth and useth this Argument, that a body cannot be in two places at once: it is the Angels Argument, *He is not here, for he is risen*, Mat. 28. 6. sufficiently implying, that he could not be here and there too: or must we say, that the Angels Argument is weak or deceitful, that yours may be strong and true?

Pop. *He meant he was not there visibly.*

Prot. It seems, if a man being sought after should hide himself with you in some corner or hole in your room, and the pursuers should ask for him, you could answer with good Conscience, *He is not here*, because he is invisible. Our Blessed Saviour every where makes these two oppo-

oppoſite, his being in the world, and going to heaven, Joh. 13. 1. *The hour was come that he ſhould depart out of this world unto the Father:* It ſeems you could have taught him the art of going thither, and keeping here too. I promiſe you, I durſt not venture to buy an Eſtate of any of you, for it ſeems you could tell how to ſell it to me, and keep it to your ſelves. You may remember, once you and I made our ſelves merry with a paſſage that one uſed in a ſpeech; that ſince he could not give content, neither by *going* nor *ſtaying*, hereafter he would neither *go* nor *ſtay*. It ſeems you have as good a faculty as he had; for you know how a man may both *go from a place*, and *ſtay in it*, at the ſame time. I know not what can be more plain if you did not ſhut your eyes: Chriſt ſaith expreſly, *me you have not always*, that is, *here*, *Mat.* 26. 11. Beſides, your doctrine deſtroyes the truth of Chriſts Humane Nature. I read of Chriſt, that *he was in all points like unto us, ſin only excepted*; his Body was like ours, and therefore it is impoſſible it ſhould be in a thouſand ſeveral places at once (as you pretend it is;) this turns Chriſts Body into a Spirit: nay, indeed you make his body more ſpiritual than a Spirit; for a Spirit cannot be in ſe-

veral places divided from its self. The soul of man, if it be entire both in the whole and in every part of the body, yet it is not divided from its self, nor from its body, nor can it be in two several bodies at the same time, as all confess; and much less can it be in ten thousand bodies at once (as by your Argument undoubtedly it may). When ever an Angel comes to earth, he leaves heaven: and so this every way destroyes the truth of Christs Humane body.

Pop. *Much of what you say was true of Christs Body in the dayes of his infirmity; but when he was risen from the dead, then he received a Spiritual Body, as it is said, ours shall be at the resurrection*, 1 Cor. 15.

Prot. To this I answer, First, that you ascribe these monstrous properties to Christs Body before its Resurrection; for you say, The Flesh and Bloud of Christ were really in the Sacrament, which the Disciples received while Christ lived. Secondly, Christs Resurrection, though it heightned the perfections, yet it did not alter the Nature and Properties of his Body, nor give it the being of a Spirit; for after he was risen, he proves that he was no Spirit, by this Argument, *Handle me and see, for a Spirit hath not flesh*

and

and bones, as you see me have, Luke 24. 39. By this it appears, that your Doctrine destroyes the Truth of Christs Humanity, at least it destroyes the main evidence of it (against those who affirmed, that Christ had only a phantastical Body) namely, that he was seen, and felt, and heard; for you say, sense is not to be believed. Again, you destroy the truth of Christs ascension into Heaven. For Christ is not ascended if he hath not left the world; for these two are joyned together, *Joh.* 16. 28. *I leave the world, and go to the Father*: but if you say true, he hath not left the world, but is here in every Sacrament; nothing can be more plain, than that Christ did visibly and locally leave this world when he went up into heaven, *Acts* 1. 9, 10. that being once there, *the heavens must receive* (or *contain*) *him, until the time of the restitution of all things*, Acts 3. 21. and that at the last day he shall come visibly and locally from heaven, 2 *Thess.* 1. 7. but that he should come down a thousand times in a day, at the command of every Mass-Priest, is such a dream, as the Scripture speaks not one syllable of, nor can any rational man believe it: Moreover, your Doctrine destroys the very Essence of a Sacrament, which consists of two parts, an

outward element or ſign, and the inward grace ſignified by it; and this I am told your Doctors acknowledge (*a*) I ſhall forbear mentioning further particulars, theſe are more than enough to ſhew the falſeneſs of this Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.

In the next place, pray let me hear what you have to ſay for your great Article of praying to Saints.

But, firſt, I am told divers of your own Authors confeſs, it is not neceſſary to pray to Saints, but only convenient: Is it ſo?

Pop. *It is true*; *and*, *I muſt confeſs*, *the Council of* Trent *do only ſay*, it is good and profitable. (*b*)

Prot. Then ſure, I will never run the hazard of committing Idolatry for an unneceſſary work. But I am further told, that your great Scholar and Wit, *Perron* confeſſeth, That *he found no footſteps of this praying to Saints*, *either in Scripture*, *or in the Fathers*, *before the four firſt Councils*, (which was ſome hundreds of years after Chriſt. (*c*). He confeſſed likewiſe to *Iſaac Caſaubone*, (as he told our Biſhop *Andrews*) that he himſelf never prayed to Saints,

(*a*) *B ll. de Sacramentis in genere, lib.* 1. *c.* 9. *&* *c.* 11.
(*b*) *De invocat.* (*c*) *ſanct. Lib.* 1. *c.* 18.

but

but only as he went in Procession *that is* for form sake. *Andr. in Opusc. Posthuma*, and that *Salmeron*, and *Cotton*, (*a*) and *Eccius* say as much in effect, *viz.* That *there is no command for this in either Testament.* Is it so?

Pop. *It is true*; *and* Bellarmine *confesseth, That* the Saints began to be worshipt, not so much by any Law, as by Custome (*b*).

Prot. Methinks these two Considerations should startle you, that it is both unnecessary and uncommanded. I perceive I am not like to hear Scripture Arguments in this point.

Pop. *Some of our Authors do urge some Scriptures, but you tie me up to use but few, and those the best Arguments; and therefore I will rather urge other Considerations.*

1. *Humility and Discretion adviseth us to this duty, for I suppose, if you have any request to the King, you do not sawcily rush into his presence, but make use of some of his Courtiers.*

Prot. But tell me, I pray you, If a King not only allows, but commands all his Subjects to *call upon him in the day of*

(*a*) *Instit.* 1. *Book.* (*b*) *Beatit. sanctorum*, l. 1. c. 8. *sect. ult.*

trouble, to come to him freely, and upon all occaſions, *to pour out their complaints to him, not doubting but he will receive and anſwer them*, and this King were alwayes at perfect leiſure to hear their requeſts, and the oftner they come to him, the welcomer they are; and he appoints his own Son the Maſter of the Requeſts, from time to time, to receive all the Petitions of his Subjects; and both the King and the Prince are ten thouſand times more compaſſionate than the Courtiers; would you not in this caſe account him a fool (and ſomewhat elſe too) that ſhould ſpend his time in petitioning this and the other inferiour Courtier to gain acceſs to the King?

Pop. *I cannot deny that.*

Prot. Then your Church hath need to make uſe of that counſel, James 1. 5. *If any man want wiſdom, let him ask it of God*; they rather chooſe to ask it of Saints, and that is the reaſon they go without it. Moſt plain it is, this is the very caſe, and ſuch a King God in all points is, and infinitely better than all this, and ſuch a Maſter of Requeſts Chriſt is: but for the humility you talk of, I think therein you do prudently; for I remember the worſhip of Angels came in under a ſhew of humility,

mility, *Col.* 2.18. and, the door being once opened, it was diſcreetly done to bring in the worſhip of Saints there too: let me hear what elſe you can ſay?

Pop. *We uſe to pray to living Saints, why not as well to departed and glorified Saints; S.* Paul *writes to the* Theſſalonians, Pray for us, *Col.* 4. 3.

Prot. Surely Scripture makes a ſufficient difference: You meet with very many Commands and Examples of Prayers or Addreſſes to the living, not one to the dead. Beſides, you know the living hear your Prayers, you know nothing that the dead do ſo: Beſides, I trow, you do not pray to the living in ſuch manner as you do to the dead; you do not religiouſly worſhip the living (and about that all our queſtion is,) Did St. *Paul* invocate the *Coloſſians*, becauſe he deſired their Prayers? Can you ſay any thing more?

Pop. *The Saints in Glory pray for us, and therefore we may pray unto them.*

Prot. Will you affirm, that I may and ought to worſhip, and pray unto all thoſe that pray for me?

Pop. *No: Then our Churches practice would condemn me; for we grant, that the Fathers in their Limbus* did, *and ſo thoſe in Purgatory* do, *pray for us, and ſo do all the*

Living ſaints upon Earth, yet we do not allow Prayers unto them.

Prot. Then your argument is loſt, from their Interceſſion to your Invocation.

Pop. *Let me hear, if you have any better Arguments againſt this practice.*

Prot. You ſhall. 1. Since all grant that Prayer is a part of Gods Worſhip, then your praying to Saints is directly contrary to Gods command, *Deut.* 6. 13. Mat. 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

Pop. *We do not worſhip the Saints, as God, with the higheſt kinde of Worſhip, which is proper to God, but only with an inferiour kinde of Religious Worſhip, and therefore do not tranſgreſs this command.*

Prot. The Devil himſelf did not require the higheſt worſhip, as I ſhewed before; yet Chriſt thought that inferiour worſhip a breach of that law. Nor did thoſe Angel-worſhippers, mentioned, *Col.* 2. worſhip the Angels as God with the higheſt worſhip, for they were either Jews, or Judaizing Chriſtians, (both of which never pretend to equalize the Angels with God, but judged them far inferiour to God, and worſhipped them accordingly) yet nevertheleſs are they con-

condemned by St. *Paul* for giving divine Honour to the Creature. Next, this praying to Saints is an high diſhonour to Jeſus Chriſt. God hath made him *the only Mediatour*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. he hath invited all perſons to come freely and boldly to him, hath promiſed *thoſe that come to him, he will in no wiſe caſt out*, *Joh.* 6. 37. why do not you then go immediately to Chriſt? This is a manifeſt queſtioning either of his power, or faithfulneſs, or goodneſs.

Pop. *It is one of the ſlanders of your Miniſters, that we diſhonour Chriſt; we only pray to Saints to pray to Chriſt.*

Prot. All your Books of Devotion confute that pretence; for you profeſs in your Maſs-book (*a*) they help you by their Merits, as well as by their Prayers. *Bellarmine* affirmeth that the *Saints in ſome ſort are our Redeemers*: (*b*) Is this no more than only to pray for you? Is it no more than this, when you pray thus to the Virgin *Mary*; *Do thou protect us, drive away evil from us, and require good things for us*: and *in right of a Mother, command thy Son*? Is it no more than this, when you ſay *the Lord was with her*, (i. e. the Virgin

(*a*) *Quorum meritis precibuſque rogamus.* (*b*) *De Indulgentiis*, l. 1. c. 4.

Mary) *and ſhe with the Lord in the ſame work of redemption*: and when Eſa. 63. is objected, *I trod the Wine-preſs alone, and there was no man with me*; they anſwer cunningly, *true Lord, there was no* MAN *with thee, but there was a* WOMAN *with thee*; (c) Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt that your famous *Biel* ſaith, that *God hath given the Virgin* Mary *half of his Kingdom*; *and that whereas he hath juſtice and mercy, he kept juſtice to himſelf, and granted mercy to the Virgin?* (d) In my opinion they ſhall do well to take in Chriſt for a ſhare in the mercy. Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt to ſay, that *Prayers which are made to, and delivered by the Saints, are better than thoſe by Chriſt*, as *Salmeron* ſaith? (e) Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt, that *Barradius* the Jeſuite asketh of Chriſt, *why he took not his Mother up with him when he aſcended up to Heaven?* and frames this anſwer; (f) *Peradventure, Lord, it was left thy heavenly Courtiers ſhould be in doubt, whether to go out to meet thee, their Lord; or her, their Lady.* Is it no diſhonour to Chriſt, that *Carolus Scribanius* (otherwiſe *Clarus Bonarſcius*) profeſſeth, *he cannot tell which to prefer, the Mo-*

(c) *In Martiali, Ann.* 1493. (d) *In Canone Miſſæ ſect.* 80. (e) *In* 1 Tim. 2. *diſ.* 8. *p.* 467. (f) *Concord. Evang. Tom.* 1. *l.* 6. *c.* 11.

thers

thers Milk, or the Sons bloud. (g) I believe neither Christ nor his Mother will give these men thanks for this another day; and all these passages are not in obscure Authors, that privily steal abroad into the World; but in eminent Persons, and Books Licensed by the Approbation, and according to the Orders of your Church: and besides, your Church owns them, in that she doth not blot them out, nor put them into her expurgatory Indices. Moreover, I must pray to none, but those in whom I must trust, *Rom.* 10. 13, 14. *How shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed?* And trust is Gods Prerogative incommunicable to any Creature, *Jer.* 17. 5. *Cursed is he that trusteth in man.* Again, I must pray to none, but to whom I may pray in faith, and without doubting; and (upon good grounds *believing that I shall receive*) *Mat.* 21. 22. *James* 1. 5, 6. But I am not sure that the Saints do hear my prayers, or can and will grant them.

Pop. *The Saints in glory do know what we pray to them.*

Prot. How doth that appear?

Pop. *There are several wayes whereby they know these things, but I adhere to*

(g) *In Amphitheatro honoris.*

what

what Bellarmine *saith that they knew this by revelation from God.*

Prot. You should not only say this, but prove it. One of your infallible Popes *Gregory* denies this, no Scripture informs you thus much; nay, that sufficiently implies, that the Saints do not particularly know, nor mind the concerns of this world. God tells *Josiah*, 2 *Chr.* 34. 28. *Thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thine eyes see the evil I will bring upon this place*, Eccl. 9. 5. *the dead know not any thing* of the particular occurrences of this life, see *Job.* 14. 21. I am sure these are ten times better arguments than what you bring for the contrary. And in a word, it is Gods incommunicable Prerogative to know the Heart, and secret Prayers, 2 *Chron.* 6. 30. *Mat.* 6. 6. So upon the whole matter, I conclude; and now by the vanity of your Arguments and Answers, do fully discern the falseness of this opinion, and the wickedness of the practice of calling upon Saints: let me hear whether you have any better evidences for the worship of Images; I hope you have: and I am sure you need very clear and strong arguments for that practice, or else you are guilty of that damnable sin of Idolatry.

Pop.

Pop. *We have very good arguments for that: I will uſe only two, and thoſe our ſtrongeſt arguments, as you deſire. Firſt, we have the example and command of God for it: he cauſed the Images of the Cherubims to be made and put upon the Ark which was to be worſhiped:* Pſal. 98. *If the Ark was to be worſhiped becauſe it repreſented Gods foot-ſtool, much more may an Image be worſhiped; as our Mr.* Biſhop *rightly argued*.*

Prot. I ſuppoſe if this be a good Argument to *us now*, it was ſo to the *Jews formerly*; for length of time doth not turn falſe arguments into true ones; tell me therefore if you had lived when the Law, *Exod.* 20. was newly given, and one had perſwaded you to worſhip Images by your own argument, what would you have anſwered?

Pop. *I would have ſaid, it doth not follow that becauſe the Ark was to be worſhiped (which God commanded them to worſhip) therefore Images were to be worſhiped (which God forbad them to worſhip.)*

Prot. Good Sir, beſtow this anſwer (as a token from me) upon any of your Brethren that ſhall argue ſo abſurdly: beſides, it ſeems very unlikely to me, that the

* Againſt *Perkins* of Images.

Cheru-

Cherubims were ordained to be worſhiped by the people, becauſe they were never ſeen by the people. You put the Images which you worſhip in the moſt viſible and conſpicuous places.

Pop. *Yet no man could worſhip the Ark but he muſt worſhip the Cherubims, for they were over the Ark.*

Prot. In that caſe the Cherubims were not at all worſhiped, unleſs you will ſay, that he that worſhips one of your wooden Images, worſhips alſo the Spider, (which peradventure is paying its devotion there, and got into the Saints mouth.) Beſides, it doth not appear that the Ark it ſelf was worſhiped, for that alſo was not ſo much as ſeen by the people, therefore not like to be worſhiped. All that we read is, that the *Iſraelites* did and ought to worſhip God toward the Ark; and ſo they are ſaid to worſhip God *toward the whole Temple, and toward Jeruſalem, and towards the Holy Mountain, and towards Heaven.* Yet I preſume you will not ſay all theſe places were to be worſhiped, and if God was to be worſhiped towards theſe places; becauſe he tells us expreſly, his ſpecial preſence was there. What is this to Images? which God baniſheth from his Houſe and preſence: and

and to conclude this, I pray you tell me, Is it lawful to worſhip every place where God is in a ſpecial manner preſent?

Pop. *I conceive it is.*

Prot. Then it is lawful to worſhip every religious man in the World; It is true, your great *Vaſquez* profeſſeth, that a man may worſhip a Stone, or a Straw, or any creature where God is, for God is there according to his eſſence. (*a*) By which Argument it ſeems Chriſt might have worſhiped the Devil; for the eſſence of God being every-where, muſt needs be in him. But what, I pray you, is your other Argument?

Pop. *The honour of God requires the worſhip of his Images, for that redounds to God; as if I honour a Prince, I will honour his Picture; and we ſhew our reverence to the King in being uncovered in his Preſence Chamber, though the King be not there.*

Prot. Tell me, I pray you, If a King forbid any Pictures of himſelf to be made, or ſet up; if any over-officious Subject ſhould, notwithſtanding this, ſet up the Kings Picture, pretending to do it in reſpect to the King; would the King eſteem himſelf honoured or diſhonoured by it?

(*a*) *De adoratione l.* 3. *diſ.* 3. *cap.* 2. *p.* 455. & 458.

Pop.

Pop. *In that case certainly the King is dishonoured, when his commands are broken, and his Authority despised.*

Prot. You say right. And so God will give you little thanks for breaking his Commands, upon pretence of his Service. If a King require such reverence to be given to his Presence-Chamber, it is fit that he should be obeyed (seeing it is only a civil, and not a religious respect:) and if God forbid any such reverence, any Religious worship should be given to any graven Images, good reason his prohibition too should be obeyed. You talk of honouring God, but for the way or means of honouring God, whether it be most reasonable to take an estimate from the Rules and Practices of all former Idolaters (who have all justified their Idolatry from this pretence of honouring God) or from the Commands of Gods Word, and the practices of the godly Jews before Christ, and godly Christians, and Fathers, for some hundreds of years after Christ (who are all known to detest all manner of Worship of Images) (*a*) I leave to any indifferent person to judge: besides, if you will needs testifie your respect to God, by honouring his Images,

(*a*) See *Dallæus de Imaginibus.*

what

what a madneſs is it to confine this honour to dead Images of Wood or Stone, and to deny it to his Saints upon earth, who are his living, and far more noble and expreſs Images:

Pop. *Since you ſcorn my Arguments, for the Worſhip of Images, let me hear your Arguments againſt it?*

Prot. My firſt Argument is this, the holy Scripture condemns it as Idolatry.

Pop. *We have Images in our Churches only as remembrancers (to put us in mind of worthy and excellent perſons) but not as objects of Worſhip.*

Prot. No friend, it is not that time of day: you cannot now deceive us with ſuch fooliſh excuſes, for your Councils of *Nice* and *Trent* do both command the Worſhipping of Images, and all your Authors plead for this.

Pop. *Well, but this I am ſure is true, we do not worſhip the Images, but only God by them, and in them; we worſhip them only as repreſentations of God or Chriſt,* &c. *and the honor paſſeth from them to God.*

Prot. That cannot acquit you, neither before God nor man. *Micah* and his Mother were guilty of Idolatry, yet the ſilver was *dedicated to the Lord* (Jehovah) *to make a graven Image*, Judg, 17. 3. alſo *Judg.* 18. 5, 6.

5, 6. And the Iſraelites are charged with Idolatry in the worſhiping of the Golden Calf, *Acts* 7. 41. 1. *Cor.* 10. 7. And yet they could not be ſo brutiſh, as to think that Golden Calf, which *they brought* out of *Egypt* in their *ear-rings*, was that God which *brought them* out of *Egypt* with ſtrong hand.

Pop. *But they ſaid*, Theſe be thy gods, O Iſrael, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt.

Prot. You uſe alſo to call an Image by the name of him whom it repreſents; you commonly ſay, this is *the Bleſſed Virgin*, or S. *Matthew*, &c. when you mean, 'tis only their Image, and ſo it cannot be ſtrange to you, that they expreſs themſelves in the ſame manner. Beſides *Aaron* himſelf proclaims the feaſt of the Calf in theſe words, *To morrow is a feaſt to Jehovah*. The Heathens alſo excuſed their Idolatry by this very pretence. So *Celſus* (*a*) and others ſaid (as the antient Fathers tell us) *We do not worſhip the Images of Gold or Braſs*, &c. *as believing them to be gods; but we worſhip the gods in them, and by them.*

(*a*) *Lib.* 7. *Contra Celſum. Arnobius lib.* 6. *Lactant. l.*2. *c.*2. *Euſebius de præparatione Evangelicâ, lib.*3. *& lib.* 4. *in Præfat.*

Pop.

Pop. *They worſhiped wicked Men, but we worſhip only Holy Men, and the Friends of God, as ſuch, and becauſe they are ſuch, and their Images, and therefore are not guilty of Idolatry.*

Prot. Then Saint *Peter*, *Acts* 10. and the Angel, *Rev.* 22. and Saint *Paul*, *Acts* 14. might have received that adoration (as being the friends of God) which they ſo utterly rejected. *Moſes* was the friend of God, yet God hid away his body, leſt the Iſraelites ſhould worſhip him. And I have heard that the Fathers charged the *Collyridians* with Idolatry, for worſhiping of the Virgin *Mary*; (*c*) and the *Arrians* for worſhiping Chriſt, whom they believed to be but a creature (though all agreed they were the friends of God.) I ſuppoſe if any man ſhould attempt to give the honour, proper to the King, to his Brother, or Friend, this would not excuſe them from Treaſon; nor will it excuſe any Adultereſs that ſhe lay with her Huſbands deareſt Friend or Relation. Again, it matters not much to this point, for what reaſon you worſhip Images: the only queſtion is, whether you do worſhip Images? for the very doing of that (whatſo-

(*c*) *Epiphanius Hæreſi* 97. *per totum.*

ever

ever pretences it may have) is Idolatry. Beſides, if you worſhipped God alone, and not the Image, your excuſe would have ſome colour; but it is moſt evident, that you worſhip not only God, but the Image too. I am told that your own *Azorius* affirms, that *it is the conſtant opinion of your Divines, that the Image is to be honored, or worſhipped, with the ſame honor and worſhip which is given to him whoſe Image it is.* (a) And that *Cajetan* (b) and *Gregory de Valentia,* (c) and *Coſterus* (d) affirm as much. And that your *Bellarmin* expreſly diſputes for this, that *Images are not only to be worſhipped as they are exemplars, but alſo properly and by themſelves, ſo as the worſhip may be terminated in them.* (e) Are theſe things true?

Pop. *I cannot deny but they are.*

Prot. Then I ſee the vanity of your pretences, and that you only ſeek to raiſe a miſt before the eyes of ignorant people; for in truth you worſhip the Image it ſelf, though happily not for its ſelf: as if a Heathen Emperor commanded his Subjects Religiouſly to Worſhip ſuch a Vice-

(a) *Lib.* 9. *Inſtit. mor. c.* 6. *art.* 3. (b) *In Thom. part.* 3. *qu.* 25. *art.* 3. (c) *Tom.* 3. *Diſp.* 6. *qu.* 11. *punct.* 6. (d) *Enchirid. p.* 438. (e) *De Imag. l.* 2. *c.* 21. *prop.* 1.

gerent

gerent of his; no man, who did worſhip that Vice-gerent, could deny that he worſhiped him, though he did it only for the Emperours ſake. Tell me, I pray you, do you not hold, that there are two kinds of Religious Worſhip; namely, abſolute, (which you give to God or the Saints) and relative, (which you give to their Images)?

Pop. *I muſt own it.*

Prot. Then it is horrible impudence to ſay, you do not give worſhip to the Images, ſince you give one of theſe two kinds unto them, and unto them only: beſides, if all you ſay were true, this would not acquit you from Idolatry; for your Church profeſſeth and commandeth the Worſhip of the Images of Saints, as well as of God and Chriſt; and ſince it is Idolatry to give Divine Honour to any creature (as I before proved) you are no leſs guilty in giving it to the Saints themſelves, than to their Images, and ſo you are double-dy'd Idolaters.

My ſecond Argument is taken from the ſecond Commandement, *Thou ſhalt not make any graven Image.*

But firſt, I pray you, tell me true, hath your Church left out this ſecond Commandment in divers of her Breviaries and Offices

Offices of Prayer, or do our Miniſters ſlander them? I hear; that *In the Hours of our Lady*, Printed at *Paris*, *An.* 1611. The Commandments of the firſt Table are ſet down in theſe words, and no other.

1. Commandment.

I am the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt not have nor worſhip any other God but me.

2. Commandment.

Thou ſhalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain.

3. Commandment.

Remember to keep holy the Sabbath Day and Feaſts.

And that the Council of *Ausburg*, *Ann.* 1548. delivering the Commandments in *Dutch* for the People, leave out the mention of Images; and, that their cheat might not be diſcovered, that the people might have their full number, they make uſe of the miſtake of one of the Fathers, and divide the laſt Command into two, againſt Senſe and Reaſon, and the practice of the whole ancient Church. Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *It is true, it is left out in ſome of our Books, but we leave it in, in all Bibles, and divers of our Catechiſms.*

Prot. Very well, I ſee you had wit in your anger; I commend your diſcretion, that

that you did not your work so grosly, that all the world should cry shame of you: But that you blotted it out in any, is an evidence of your guilt. But what say you to this Argument?

Pop. *Then my first answer is, That this Command was peculiar to the Jews, who were most prone to Idolatry* *.

Prot. This is not true. It sufficiently appears that the Gentiles were under the obligation of this Law, from those punishments which God inflicted upon them for their transgression or breach of it by Idolatry, *Rom.* 1. But *where there is no Law, there is no transgression.* Besides, Christ tells us, *He came not to destroy the Law*, (the Moral Law) *but to fulfil it*, Mat. 5. 17. Belike, you are not of his minde; And dare you say the Jews, as soon as they believed in Christ, were discharged from this command, and allowed to worship the Images which that command forbad?

Pop. *I will not say so; but I have a second Answer, The thing prohibited here is not* Images, *(which are representations of real things) as you falsly render it, but* Idols, *which are the Images of false gods,*

* Vasquez *de adoratione.*

which

which are not, and never were in the world.

Prot. The Text its self is full against you; for the Images there prohibited, are not said to be the Images of the false gods of the Heathens (whereof many never had any being) but the Images *of any thing in heaven or earth*, &c. Moreover, divers of the Heathen gods were men whom they deified. I hope their Pictures were Pictures of real things, yet these are Idols.

Pop. *Though they really were Men, yet their pictures were made to represent them as gods, and such they were not really, and therefore were Idols.*

Prot. The learned Heathens knew (as well as you and I do) that *Jupiter*, and *Mars*, and *Mercury*, and the rest, were meer Men, (and they smiled at the ignorance of their Vulgar, that thought otherwise) only they thought of them just as you do of the Saints, that the great God had put some of his honour upon them, and therefore they might worship them, you cannot be so silly to think, the learned Heathens thought *Augustus* was a god really, when he was dead; yet their worship of his Image was Idolatry. And they that worshiped the Image of *Caligula* (while he lived) were not so sottish

to

to take him for a god (whom they knew to be a fooliſh and wicked man) yet I hope you will not excuſe them from Idolatry. But further, as the Jews did univerſally underſtand this to be a prohibition of all manner of Images; ſo all the Prophets, and Chriſt, and the Apoſtles were ſo far from reproving them (which they would have done, if it had been an Error) that they every where ſtrengthen them in this opinion, by declaiming againſt all worſhip of Images, without any diſtinction. And tell me, I pray you, if any Jew had at that time made (for inſtance) an Image of the Sun not looking on it as God, but as a glorious creature of God, and therefore fit to be religiouſly worſhipped (as you think of the Saints and Angels) and had bowed down to it and worſhipped it: Do you think he had not broken this Law?

Pop. *I dare not deny but he had broken it.*

Prot. Yet this had been no *Idol*, but an *Image*, according to your ſenſe of it. Beſides, I find that all manner of Images are forbidden, *Lev.* 26. 1. howſoever, to me you ſeem to venture your ſalvation upon a nice point; for the *Hebrew* word is neither *Image* nor *Idol*, but *Peſel*, as a *Divine*

told me; and this, I underſtand is diverſly tranſlated; ſome render it an *Image*, others an *Idol*. Now you venture your ſoul upon it, that the laſt is the only true Tranſlation, which is a dreadful hazard; becauſe it is otherwiſe rendred, not only by Proteſtants, but by the moſt and beſt ancient Interpreters *, even thoſe whom your Vulgar Tranſlation very oft follows in other places. Theſe render it not an *Idol*, but a *graven Image*; and the Seventy Interpreters (I am aſſured) do promiſcuouſly render the word ſometimes *an Idol*, ſometimes *a graven Image*: Nay, more than this, that it may appear how deſperate your cauſe is, I am informed your own Vulgar Tranſlation (from which you are obliged not to ſwerve) doth frequently render it not *Idol*, but *a graven Image* (*Sculptile*) particularly in *Exod.* 20. 4. *Levit.* 26. 1. & *Deut.* 4. 16, 25. & 5. 8. Are theſe things ſo?

Pop. *I cannot deny it, for the Authors themſelves would confute me; But one thing I have to ſay, you muſt underſtand one Scripture ſo as to agree with another: Now I find God himſelf allows and*

---

* *Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Sic Joſephus, & Philo Judæus.*

preſcribes

prescribes some Images, as those of the Cherubims; either then he contradicts himself, or he doth not forbid all Images, but Idols onely.

Prot. Though I might say, God may make an exception to some of his Laws, when no man can (as in the case of *Abraham*'s offering up *Isaac*, and the *Israelites* spoiling the *Ægyptians* of their Jewels) yet I need no other answer but this; I directly deny that here is any contradiction at all: For our question is not about the making of Images (whether by Gods order or Mans) but about the worshipping of them. And albeit there were such Images made, yet they were not made to be worshipped, as I before proved; nor was there any danger the people should worship them, because they were not admitted to see them. But I pray you answer me this one question, I am told that divers of your own Authors confess, that the Jews indeed were, though Christians are not forbidden the use of Images by this command. Is it so?

Pop. *These indeed are the words of our famous* Vasquez, *after he hath mentioned divers Authors for the contrary opinion,* There are (*saith he*) other Authors, neither fewer, nor inferiour to them, who are

of the contrary opinion, which to me always seemed most probable, to wit, that all the use of Images is here forbidden to the Jews (*a*), *and for this he quotes many of our approved Authors*; *and* Salmeron *saith no less* (*b*).

Prot. And you need say no more, for then all these Authors thought your distinction of *Image* and *Idol* frivolous, and that the word *Pesel* is meant of any *Images*, and not of *Idols* only, as you foolishly distinguish, and so your principal refuge is lost, and you are convicted Idolaters, and then, if you repent not, you know where your portion will be. *Go now and brag of the safeness of your Religion.*

I see how little it is that you can say for your Worship of the Dead (Saints and their Images) let me hear whether you have any better Arguments for your Prayers for the Dead and Purgatory.

Pop. *I am glad you mention that, since all your Divines do agree that Prayer for the Dead was the practice of the Antient Church and Fathers.*

Prot. If that be true, it is not sufficient for your purpose, for I am fully sa-

(*a*) *De Adorat. l. 2. def. 4. c. 2.* (*b*) *In* Rom. *disp. 29. sect. prima.*

tisfied

tisfied that the Fathers were not infallible, and your own greateſt Doctors think ſo too *. But beſides, I am told that their Prayers for the dead were quite of another nature than yours, and for other purpoſes, and they were grounded upon ſome private opinions of theirs, which you diſown; for they prayed not only for thoſe whom you ſuppoſe to be in Purgatory, but for thoſe who (you confeſs) many of them never did come there: they pray *for all the Saints from the righteous* Abel *to this day*; they pray *for all their Anceſtors, Patriarchs, Prophets, and Martyrs*, as I have heard it in ſome of their Liturgies. Is it ſo?

Pop. *It is ſo.*

Prot. I pray you tell me, what do you pray for the Dead?

Pop. *We pray that God would deliver them from thoſe dreadful pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. Then if there be no Purgatory, the foundation of your Prayers for the dead is gone.

Pop. *I grant it.*

Prot. Then let us diſcourſe of the moſt fundamental point, (as we have hitherto done) the reſt will fall of courſe. Therefore

---

* *See Nullity. c.* 3.

First, I pray you tell me your opinion concerning Purgatory.

Pop. *Our Doctrine in brief is this, That* though God freely gives, to all that are truly penitent, forgiveneſs of their ſins, and freedom from eternal death; yet ſince they have much venial ſin and corruption in them, in which oft-times they die: therefore it is neceſſary that they ſhould, for the expiation of thoſe ſins, and for the ſatisfaction of Gods Juſtice, either do or ſuffer, ſuch Penances, Faſtings, Prayers, &c. as are enjoyned them here, or (*where thoſe are not ſufficient*) ſuffer the pains of Purgatorie.

Prot. I underſtand your Doctrine; now let me hear two of your ſtrongeſt Arguments to prove it: I hear that *Bellarmin* threatens us, that *whoſoever doth not believe Purgatory, ſhall be tormented in Hell* (*a*) Is it true?

Pop. *He doth ſay ſo, and I am of his mind.*

Prot. Then I hope you have very clear Arguments for it, becauſe you lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon it, But firſt, I have heard that this Doctrine of Purgatory is confeſſed by divers of your own Brethren

(*a*) *Bell. de Purgat. l. 1. c. ult.*

to

to be but a new Doctrine. Is it so?

Pop. *I will not dissemble with you, several of our Doctors have unadvisedly blurted out such expressions as these; our famous English Martyr* Fisher *Bishop of* Rochester *confesseth, That* Purgatory was for a long time unknown, and either never or very seldom mentioned among the Antient Fathers (*b*), *and* Alphonsus de Castro *saith, That* many things are known to us, of which the Antient Writers were altogether ignorant (*c*); *and amongst them he reckons Purgatory*, which (*saith he*) the Greek Writers mentioned not, and even to this day it is not believed by the Greek Church.

Prot. I suppose, you do not think all these Antient Fathers were damned.

Pop. *No, God forbid, for many of them were glorious Confessors and Martyrs.*

Prot. Then I see *Bellarmines* threats are not very formidable. But to let this pass, How do you prove this Doctrine?

Pop. *From plain Scripture*, 1. *From* Matth. 12. 32. Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be for-

(*b*) *In confut. Luther. art.* 18. (*c*) *Adv. hæreses l.* 12. *tit. Purgat. f.* 258.

given him neither in this world, neither in the world to come. *Which clearly implies, that ſome ſins not forgiven in this world, are forgiven in the next, and that muſt be in Purgatory.*

Prot. I pray you tell me, what ſins are they which are forgiven in Purgatory?

Pop. *Not great and mortal, but ſmall and venial ſins, as we all agree.*

Prot. Is not blaſphemy againſt the Son of Man a mortal ſin?

Pop. *Yes doubtleſs, But what of that?*

Prot. If this Text proves the pardon of any ſins, it proves the pardon of that ſin no leſs than others, becauſe the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt is here ſpoken of as the only ſin which is unpardonable in both worlds: Beſides, Chriſt ſpeaks thus in oppoſition to a corrupt opinion, which, I have heard, now is, and then was rife among the Jews, to wit, that divers of their ſins were pardoned after this life, and that this was one of their antient Prayers, *Let my death be the expiation of all my ſins:* for they thought the ſufferings of this life and death, the laſt of them, did free them from the puniſhments of the other life: And I have heard that it was one of their ſayings, That *every Iſraelite hath a part in the future life:* Are theſe things ſo?

Pop.

Pop. *To deal freely with you. This is not onely true, but it is one of our Arguments for Purgatory, that* Jason *the* Cyrenian (*who lived long before Christs time*) *expresly affirms, that* it is profitable to pray for the dead, that their sins may be pardoned, 2 *Mac.* 12.

Prot. I think that is impertinently alledged for Purgatory; for the sin those men died in, was a mortal sin, (as you confess) and therefore not pardonable in Purgatory. But I thank you for this; for now I am satisfied that it was an ancient opinion among the *Jews*, and so Christ had just occasion to use this expression, to confute that vain expectation of theirs. But besides, the meaning of this phrase, *Shall not be forgiven*, is, that *it shall be punished in both Worlds:* this is a frequent phrase in Scripture. Thus *Exod.* 20. 7. *God will not hold him guiltless*, that is, he will severely punish: *To accept persons in judgement is not good*, that is, *is very bad*; *The father of a fool rejoyceth not*, that is, *grieveth much.* I hear S. *Chrysostome* expounds it thus *, and a greater than he, S. *Mark* 3. 29. *He hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation.*

* *In locum.*

Beſides all this, we all agree that there is a kind of forgiveneſs of ſin after this life, and at the Day of Judgement, Acts 3. 19. *Repent, that your ſins may be blotted out, when the times of refreſhing ſhall come from the preſence of the Lord*; for then indeed the pardon of ſin is compleated and fully manifeſted. And it is a common phraſe in Scripture to ſpeak of a thing as done, when it is onely declared and manifeſted, as the Apoſtle ſaith, thoſe words, Pſal. 2. *This day have I begotten thee*, were fulfilled in Chriſts Reſurrection, *Act.* 13. becauſe that declared him to be the onely begotten Son of God, as S. *Paul* ſaith, *Rom.* 1. 4.

To which I might add, that by *the World to come*, Chriſt may very probably underſtand the time of the New Teſtament, which begun at Chriſts death. The *Jews* (I hear) oft uſe this expreſſion of the days of the Meſſias. Nay, the Apoſtle himſelf doth ſo, *Heb.* 2. 5. This alſo I have read, that the *Jews* did generally expect a more plentiful and glorious remiſſion of ſins at that time, and ſo Chriſts meaning may be this, That *this blaſphemy ſhall not be forgiven*, neither in that time nor ſtate of the Church, (in which Chriſt then was) nor in the time of the Goſpel

and

and Kingdom of the Messias which began at his dearth (as I said) when, though there should be many great sins and sinners pardoned (as we see there were) yet this should not. I hope you will not brag much of your Argument from this place, let me hear your other place.

Pop. *My second Argument is from,* 1 Cor. 3. 15. He shall be saved, yet so as by fire, *that is, the fire of Purgatory.*

Prot. It seems you understand this fire properly, which is something strange when the whole place is metaphorical, or figurative; *The Gold and Silver, Hay and Stubble,* all are metaphorical, and so doubtless is *the fire.* I hear your *Bellarmin* confesseth, that *the fire* mentioned, *v.* 13. *The fire shall try every mans work,* is not meant of Purgatory.

Pop. *He doth indeed say so.*

Prot. That is enough to overthrow this Argument, for it is most evident that the fire, *vers.* 13. and 15. is one and the same. And this Fire cannot be Purgatory, 1. Because it is the Fire of the Day of Judgement, when you confess Purgatory ends. (*d*) The time of the last Judgement is called the Day by way of eminency, *Heb.*

(*d*) *Bell. de Purg. l.* 2. *c.* 9. *§. Jam vero.*

10. 25.

10. 25. 2 *Tim.* 1. 12, 18. and 4. 8. and 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 4. And *the day of revelation or manifeſtation of all things*, (becauſe then all mens works will be manifeſted) and *the day wherein Chriſt will come in flaming fire.* 2 This fire burns the works of men, onely their Hay and Stubble, not their perſons, as your Purgatory doth. 3 This fire tries both good and bad. All paſs through it. The *Gold* and *Silver* is in this fire no leſs than the *Hay* and *Stubble.*

Pop. *How then, I pray you, do you underſtand this place?*

Prot. It is a Metaphor, or Figurative way of ſpeaking; frequent in Scripture, and common uſe. The delivered Jews are ſaid to be as a *fire-brand pluckt out of the burning*, *Amos* 4. 11. *Zach.* 3. 2. So here, *he ſhall be ſaved ſo as by fire*, that is, not without difficulty and loſs, and poſſibly ſome momentary ſhame: but howſoever the fire ſhall burn up his work, and he ſhall loſe that part of his reward. Now I have heard your Arguments, I hope you will hear mine.

Pop. *I am ready to do that.*

Prot. I ſhall urge onely two.

Firſt, Chriſt hath fully paid our debt, and ſatisfied Gods Juſtice for all our offences;

fences; and therefore it were injuſtice in God to require the payment of any part of that debt in Purgatory. Chriſt is a compleat Saviour, *His bloud cleanſeth us from all ſin*, 1 Joh. 1.7. *He is able* (and ſure he is no leſs willing) *to ſave to the uttermoſt, thoſe that come to him*, *Heb.*7.25. God *laid all our ſins upon him*, *Iſa.* 53. and he *bare them all in his body*, 1 *Pet.*2.24. In ſhort, either you make Chriſt but an half Saviour, and Believers waſh away part of their own guilt; or if Chriſt hath fully waſhed away their guilt, you make God both unmerciful, and unjuſt, and untrue too; ſo dreadfully to puniſh innocent perſons, and thoſe too his own children (as you acknowledge) whom he declares he hath freely and fully pardoned; and to do this for ſins, which you confeſs venial, and ſuch as do not deſerve the loſs of Gods favour, and that without any neceſſity. This is not the act of a Father, eſpecially ſo tender a Father as God is.

Pop. *Chriſt is a ſufficient Saviour, and hath fully ſatisfied, but his ſatisfaction is applied to us by the pains of Purgatory.*

Prot. If Purgatory onely apply Chriſts ſatisfaction to us, then he ſatisfied for our *temporal* as well as our eternal puniſhments; and if he did ſo, ſurely he did

it

it fully, or not at all. Beſides, you need not trouble your heads about the application; God hath provided for us more comfortable means of application, on his part, *the Word, Sacraments, and Spirit*; on our parts, *Faith*. You may keep Purgatory for your own uſe, it is not fit you ſhould be peſtered with any Hereticks there. But was ever ſuch an application of Gods Grace heard of ſince the World began; that God ſhould apply his Mercy, and the Grace of Chriſt Jeſus, by ſuch exquiſite torments? This is (as one truly ſaith) *as if a man ſhould apply Phyſick by poiſon, or apply the light of the Sun, by putting out our eyes.* God deliver us from ſuch appliers. This is as if a Prince ſhould pretend a free pardon to a Malefactor, and apply it by putting him upon the Rack.

Pop. *Though Chriſt made ſatisfaction for the guilt of mortal ſins, and eternal puniſhment, yet he did not for venial ſins, nor temporal puniſhment; and therefore they muſt purge out thoſe themſelves in Purgatory.*

Prot. If it were true that you ſay, yet there is no need of Purgatory; for this purging work may be done by temporal afflictions in this life. The truth is, you add ſin to ſin, and excuſe one errour with another. But what do you mean by venial ſins?

Pop.

Pop. *We mean such smaller sins as do not exclude a man from Gods favour, nor from Heaven.*

Prot. Then surely you have very slight thoughts of Sin, of God, and of his Law, that can so judge of such an horrid evil as Sin. Scripture fully condemns this Doctrine. It tells me that *the wages of sin* (all sin, without any difference) *is death*, even that death which is opposite to eternal life, *Rom.*6.23. that *He that shall break the least of Gods commands, and teach men so*, (though peradventure he do it ignorantly, and so according to your opinion, it is a venial sin) *shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven*; that is, he shall have no portion there. It tells me, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the Book of the Law to do them*, *Gal.* 3.10. And he speaks of that curse which Christ underwent for us, and redeemed us from. It tells me, that *for every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the Day of Judgement*, (and *by such words*, if not repented of, *they shall be condemned*) *Mat.* 12.36, 37. So now your foundation, and one of the Pillars of Purgatory is gone. And as for your other fansie, that Christ did not satisfie for our temporal punishments, I pray you tell me,

did

did not Christ suffer temporal afflictions?

Pop. *Yes doubtless, the whole Gospel is full of such sufferings.*

Prot. Surely all that Christ suffered, he suffered for us, both in our stead, and for our good. He was cut off, *not for himself*, (but for our sins) *Dan.*9.25. It was for our sakes that he bare that temporal part of the curse, to *be hanged on a Tree*; and all that pain and shame was but atemporal punishment, *Gal.* 3.13. I read, *Isa.* 53. that *Christ bore our griefs, and carried our sorrows*, *v.* 4. which was not onely accomplished in this, that he bare the guilt of our sins, as S. *Peter* expounds it, 1 *Pet.*2.24. but also in this, that he delivered them from sicknesses and temporal afflictions, as S. *Matthew* expounds it, (*Mat.*8.16,17. and both these consist well together, since Christ removed both sin the cause, and affliction the effect of it.

Pop. *If Christ had satisfied for our temporal punishments, then Believers shou'd be free from all pains, and loss, and death, which it is apparent they are not; and therefore notwithstanding the fulness of Christs satisfaction, they may be liable to pains in Purgatory as well as in this life.*

Prot. To this I answer three things.

First, Your inference from the pains of this

this life to the torments of Purgatory is weak, and falſe. I may, and muſt believe, that God afflicts his people here, becauſe Scripture and Experience put it out of doubt. But that God will puniſh his people in Purgatory after this life, no Scripture affirms. You that can multiply your inſtances of the ſufferings of Believers in this life, and can tell us of *Adam*, and *David*, and *Solomon*, and many others, have not to this day been able (though often urged) to produce one inſtance of the ſufferings of any one Believer after this life (which one conſideration is ſufficient to overthrow this Argument in the judgement of any indifferent man.)

Secondly, There is not the ſame reaſon for the ſufferings of Believers here, and thoſe which you ſuppoſe in Purgatory, nor are they of the ſame nature. The preſent ſufferings of Believers are neceſſary, (1 *Pet.* 1. 6. *You are in heavineſs if need be*) both for Believers themſelves to ſubdue the Fleſh, which in this life is potent, and altogether needs ſuch a curb. *By this ſhall the iniquity of Jacob be purged*, Iſa. 27. 9. and to prevent their eternal damnation, 1 *Cor.* 11. 32. as alſo for the terror and caution of other offenders. So that, albeit Chriſt hath fully paid the debt, yet it

is

is upon other accounts convenient that they ſhould ſmart and ſuffer here. But there is no ſuch neceſſity nor uſe of Purgatory ſufferings, neither for Believers themſelves (ſince there is no mortification of corruption after this life, no temptations to ſin there, no improvement of grace, no fear of eternal damnation) (*a*) nor for example and warning to others; For their fellow-ſufferers in Purgatory, you do not pretend they are at all edified by their ſufferings; and men here, they neither ſee nor know any thing of theſe pains, nor hath God revealed any thing concerning them; but when God makes any examples to others, he ſets them in the view of others, or at leaſt acquaints them fully therewith, as he did with Hell torments to this end. It were a ſenſleſs thing to hang up a man in *Jamaica*, for the terror of thoſe that live in *England*. Beſides, the ſufferings of Believers here do come from the love, and faithfulneſs of God, *Heb.* 12. 6. *Whom the Lord loveth he chaſteneth. Pſal.* 119. 75. *In faithfulneſs thou haſt afflicted me.* Accordingly,

(*a*) *In Purgatorio animæ nec mereri nec peccare poſſunt*, Bel. de Purg. l. 2. cap. 2.
Animæ in Purgatorio certæ ſunt de ſuâ ſalute, ibid. cap. 4.

good

good men have looked upon them as choice mercies, *Psal.* 94. 12. *Blessed is the man whom thou chastnest*, and *Psal.* 119. 67. *It was good for me that I was afflicted*: and the denial of afflictions is threatned as a grievous punishment, *Is.* 1. 5. *Hos.* 4. 14, 17.

But now the sufferings of Purgatory are in all points contrary; they are purely vindictive, and the effects of meer wrath: nor do you esteem those sufferings a mercy, and your happiness, but freedom from them. And therefore your Argument, from the pains of this life to those in Purgatory, is foolish and absurd.

Thirdly, Believers sufferings here do not at all derogate from the fulness of our Redemption by Christ, because (as I have shewed) admitting that to be compleat, yet they are necessary for other purposes. But your Purgatory sufferings do, by communicating at least some part of his proper work to your selves. You profess they wash away part of your sins, which is Christs peculiar honor, *He washed us from our sins in his own blood*, *Rev.* 1. 5. You make them a part of the curse of the Law *from which* (and not only from a part of it) *Christ hath redeemed us, himself being made a curse for us*, *Gal.* 3. 13. You make them a real satisfaction in part to Gods

Gods juſtice (which is not ſatisfied by all that Chriſt did or ſuffered without them.) And, in a word, you make men in part their own Redeemers and Saviours. I hope by this you ſee how weakly you reaſon from preſent troubles, to Purgatory torments; and that notwithſtanding your objection, my firſt Argument ſtands good againſt Purgatory.

My ſecond Argument is this, that the Scripture every where ſpeaks of the ſtate of Believers immediately after death, as happy and bleſſed; and that all the ſufferings of Believers are confined to this life; and of this we have many expreſſions and examples too in Scripture, and not one to the contrary. *The ſufferings of this preſent time* (ſaith S. *Paul*) *are not worthy to be compared with the glory*, Rom. 8. 18. He knew no other ſufferings: the afflictions of Believers are *light*, *and but for a moment*, and they too are in *things that are ſeen*, 2 *Cor.* 4. 17, 18. and therefore he knew of no ſufferings in the inviſible world, unleſs happily you will ſay that S. *Paul*'s Travels were in another road into the third heavens, and ſo he was ignorant of Purgatory. *Lazarus received his evil things in this life*, Luke 16. 25. *But now he is comforted*, therefore ſurely not in Purgatory.

If

If our earthly house of this Tabernacle be dissolved, we have an house in Heaven, saith S. *Paul,* 2 Cor. 5. 1. *We are no longer absent from the Lord, than present in the Body,* saith S. *Paul,* 2 Cor. 5. 6, 7, 8. The Prophet assures us, that when righteous men die, *they enter into peace, they rest in their beds,* Isa. 57. 1, 2. I tell you, their beds are very hard, and the Prophets mistake was very great, if they be frying in the flames of Purgatory. The *Beggar died* (and it follows immediately) *he was carried by Angels into Abrahams bosom.* I cannot think these Angels mistook their way: the Thief was to be with *Christ that day in Paradise,* Luke 23. 43.

Pop. *The Thief was a kind of Martyr, and so had that priviledge.*

Prot. His death was so far from being a Martyrdom, that it was a just punishment for his evil deeds, as he confesseth, *v.* 41. But because some of your Martyrs (as you call them) were indeed Malefactors; therefore to salve their honour, you make this Malefactor a Martyr. I will give you but one place more of many, and that is, *Rev.* 14. 13. *Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord, from henceforth, that they may rest from their labours.* A place so clear, that I am told, a famous Doctor of your own

own, and one of the *Sorbon*-Colledge, *Picherellus* by name, did ingenuously confess, S. *John* had in these few words put out the fire of Purgatory. (*a*) And I am perswaded you would have been ashamed to have kindled it again, but that by this craft you get all your living.

I think I need say no more to this point, let us now go to another. We have discoursed of Purgatory: Now if you please, let us discourse of the ways whereby you pretend to free men from it, which is by Absolutions, and Indulgences, and that which is necessary thereunto, to wit, Auricular Confession.

Pop. *It is well you mention that, for I assure you it is a matter of salvation and damnation; our Council of* Trent *hath determined that* it is by divine right necessary, *and as attrition alone (which is a grief for sin, arising onely from a fear of hell) will save a man where confession to a Priest follows; so all the repentance in the world will never save him,* without this Confession *to a Priest,* viz. actual *where it may be had, or* in desire *when it cannot be actually had.*

Prot. Since you lay so much stress upon it, I expect suitable evidence for it.

(*a*) *De Missâ.* p. 156.

But

But first I pray you inform me, what your Doctrine is in this Point.

Pop. *I will give you that in the words of the Council of* Trent *as near as I can: they say, That* every Christian is bound under pain of damnation, to confess to a Priest all his mortal sins, which after diligent examination he can possibly remember; yea, even his most secret sins, his very thoughts; yea, and all the Circumstances of them which are of any moment (*a*).

Prot. Now let me hear your strongest Arguments to prove this.

Pop. *You shall: Our two great Arguments are these; First, Priests are by God made Judges, and intrusted with power of the Keys for the Remission of Sins: but no Judges can exercise judicature, unless they know and understand the cause; and the Priest must know all the particular sins, and their circumstances by the mans own confession, or else he knows not whether to bind or loose him, to forgive or to condemn him: This is the Argument upon which the Council of* Trent *builds their Decree* (*b*).

Prot. Tell me I pray you; Is it necessary to Salvation, to confess every parti-

(*a*) *Concil. Trident. sess.* 14. *de pœnitentia cap.* 4.
(*b*) *Ibid.*

cular

cular mortal sin? What if a man unavoidably forget some of them?

Pop. *In that case we confess they may be pardoned without it, and it may suffice to say with* David, Cleanse thy servant from secret sins *.

Prot. Now your Argument is quite lost: For it seems in this case (which may be in many hundreds of sins, especially in a person of bad memory) your Judge can pass sentence without knowing the particular Cause, and therefore such knowledge is not necessary to his giving Absolution. Moreover, Tell me, I pray you, may not a Priest absolve him from his sins, whom Christ hath absolved?

Pop. *Yes doubtless.*

Prot. And is not every Priest bound to believe, that Christ hath absolved every person that is truly penitent?

Pop. *There is no question of that.*

Prot. Suppose a sinner hath visibly forsaken all his wicked ways and company, and lives a very holy life before he comes to the Priest, and the Priest is certainly informed of this: Is not the Priest bound in that case to believe he is truly penitent?

---

* *Ibid.*

Pop.

Pop. *I should be most uncharitable if I should deny that.*

Prot. Then he may without any more ado upon his desire absolve him, because it appears that Christ hath absolved him. It is not at all necessary to a Priest to this purpose to know whether a man be a greater or a less sinner, since the grace of God is offered unto great as well as little sinners: and therefore seeing this is your strong argument, and that learned Council could find no better, I see your cause is very low and bad; but I suppose you have some other Argument for it.

Pop. *There is so, and that is* Jam. 5. 16. Confess your faults one to another.

Prot. Is this your strong argument? here is not a word of the Priest, nor of Confession to him, but only to our fellow Christians: this confession is mutual, and it will as well prove that the Priest is bound to confess his sins to the People, as that the People are bound to confess to the Priest: the very next words are, *Pray one for another*; what are we bound to pray only for the Priest? It is one thing that sets me against your Religion to consider what pitiful arguments you rely upon. I am assured your own brethren confess the weakness of this argument, as

Vasquez (a) and *Cajeton* (b) and *Canus* (c) but it seems you have no better. The weakness of your arguments for it, might save me the labour of mine against it; therefore I shall only offer to your thoughts these two considerations.

1. Your doctrine makes that necessary to salvation which God hath not made necessary. There is no command of God or Christ for it, as your eminent Doctors acknowledge, * and it sufficiently appears from the vanity of your proofs for it, you confess it was not necessary in the old Testament and yet there was as much need and use of it then as now, and Christ hath made the condition of his Church not more, but less burthensome than it was before. Many commands and exhortations to repentance there are in Scripture, not one which either commands this auricular confession to a Priest or declares the necessity of it, produce one place and I yield; there are many instances of *John* the Baptist and Christ and the Apostles, either actuall giving, or in Gods name

(a) *In* 3. *Thom. qu.* 90. *Art* 1. *sect. Omittimus.* (b) *In locum.* (c) *Relect. de pœnit. part.* 6. * *Scotus et omnes decretorum interpretes inquit Maldon in summâ qu.* 18. *Art.* 4. *Cajet. in Joh.* 20. 22. *Bell. de pœnit. l.* 1. *c.* 14.

proposing

propoſing and offering remiſſion of ſins upon the conditions preſcribed in the Goſpel (*a*) among which not one of them requires this auricular confeſſion: Bring one inſtance to the point and I yield.

Pop. *I will give you two inſtances*, Mat. 3. 6. The Phariſees were baptized—— confeſſing their ſins: and, the conjurers confeſſed their ſins, *Acts* 19. 18.

Prot. Theſe places do both ſpeak of publick confeſſion and in caſe of ſcandalous ſins (which we acknowledge to be a duty) but what is this to auricular confeſſion? will you never ſpeak to the purpoſe? beſides theſe places cannot be meant of auricular confeſſion for that was not then inſtituted as your council of *Trent* confeſſeth. Well, I ſee you can bring neither inſtance of this confeſſion nor precept for it, and therefore I am ſure there is no ſin in the neglect of it, for *where there is no law there is no tranſgreſſion*, Rom. 4. 15.

2. Your doctrine makes that inſufficient for pardon and ſalvation which God makes ſufficient. The great God aſſureth us. *That he that confeſſeth and forſaketh his ſins ſhall finde mercy.* Prov. 28. 13.

(*a*) Luke 18. 13. Mat. 9. 2. Act. 2. 38. & 3. 19 & 22. 16.

Pop. *That makes againſt you, for you ſee there is confeſſion required.*

Prot. And no doubt it is a mans duty to make confeſſion to God, and in caſe of wrong, unto men, and ſometimes to a Miniſter alſo, as in caſe of doubt or trouble of conſcience, but this is nothing to auricular confeſſion, nor can the text mean that, for you grant it was not as yet inſtituted. God declares that *if the wicked forſake his* (evil) *way and thoughts and turn unto God, he ſhall have mercy*, Iſa. 55. 7. *ſo* Iſa. 1. 16, 17, 18. *ſo* Act. 16. 31 St. *Paul* in Gods name promiſeth, *believe on the Lord Jeſus and thou ſhalt be ſaved.* Thus Ro. 10. 13. *Whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved:* And who dares ſay that he that doth all theſe things ſhall not be ſaved, unleſs he confeſs to a Prieſt, ſince God never ſpake ſuch a word? What is it to add to Gods word, if this be not? The terms upon which Chriſt offered promiſed ſalvation, are *Repent and believe.*

Pop. *Auricular confeſſion is a part of repentance.*

Prot. When Chriſt preached that doctrine it was no part of repentance, for you confeſs it was not then inſtituted, your Council of *Trent* determines, that it was inſtituted by Chriſt after his re-

ſurrection

surrection *. And you will find it hard to perswade any rational man, that repentance wanted a necessary part before Christs resurrection, or that it was of one kind before it and quite another after it. But I will not waste more time about so vain a fancy, for my part I rest upon Christs gracious promises to repenting and believing Sinners: By Gods grace I will endeavour to do these things, and I doubt not but he will make good his words whether you will or no; let God be true and every man a lyar.

But possibly you have better arguments for Absolutions *and Indulgences*: Produce them, but first let me hear what your doctrine in this point is.

Pop. *I will give you this in brief together with the rise and ground of it: We believe*, 1st. That there are divers Saints who have not only merit for themselves, but a great deal to spare, and all their merits are put into one treasury. 2ly. That these merits are appliable to others, so as God will pardon *Thomas*, for example, for *Johns* merit. 3ly. That God hath put this treasure into the Churches, that is, the Popes hands, and from him into the hands of all Priests, who have a power to apply these merits as they see fit.

* De Pœnitentiâ.

Prot: There is nothing sound and solid in this whole discourse, first, I have proved that there is no Purgatory, there is your foundation of indulgences gone; next I hope ere we part to shew, that there is no such thing as merit in good works, which is another of your foundations. Next, that *any mans merits* (except Christs) may be applied to another, I pray you inform me, for I have learned quite otherwise: I read that *every one shall bear his own burden*, Gal. 6. 6. *Every one shall receive according to what* HE *hath done in his body*, 2 Cor. 5. 10. The wise Virgins differed from you, they thought they had oyl little enough for themselves and none at all to spare, *Mat.* 25. 9. So if you are Virgins, it seems you are none of that sort. If you can prove this conceit of yours, do.

Pop. *I will give you a clear place*, Col. 1. 24. S. Paul *saith*, I now rejoyce in my sufferings for you and fill up that which is behind or that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his bodies sake which is the Church.

Prot. First tell me, do you think any thing was lacking or defective in Christs sufferings.

Pop. *No, You use to charge us with that opinion, but falsly.* *Prot.*

Prot. It is well you grant thus much, but if you denied it, a cloud of plain Scriptures would force you to grant it, which tell us that *by one offering Christ perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, He. 10. 14. And that *he is able to save to the uttermost* Heb. 7. 25. By *sufferings of Christ* then, we must understand the sufferings of Christ mystical, or Christ in his members, which are usually so called; (*a*) when Christ had done suffering in his person, he left it as a legacy to his members that they should suffer with him, and for him, (*b*) and St. *Paul* bore his share in these sufferings; and for the last clause of his *suffering for the Church*, This phrase, it is true, is ambiguous *and sometimes indeed it signifies to satisfie Gods justice for another*, but in this sense St. *Paul* rejects it with indignation, 1 *Cor.* 1. 13. *was Paul crucified for you?* But it is not alwaies thus taken, for St. *Paul* saith he suffered for *Christ*, 2 *Cor.* 12. 10. not surely to satisfie for him: There is therefore another sense, and that is, he suffered for the Churches edification and establishment, and so indeed he elsewhere explains himself, *Phil.* 1. 12. and I am told that your own brethren understand it thus, (*c*) and

(*a*) *Act.* 9. 4. 2 *Cor.* 1. 7. *Heb.* 11. 27. (*b*) *Act* 9. 16 & 14. 22. 2 *Tim.* 3. 12. (*c*) *Tho Est. Justin. in locum.*

your *Bellarmin* confesseth the words may be thus expounded, but only saith, *the words may conveniently receive this sense* (*a*) which is as much as to say, if you will be courteous you may grant him the Argument, but if you do not, he cannot prove it. But, admit there be such a treasury of Merits for others; as you pretended, how prove you that your Priests are made Judges, and invested with such a power of distributing those Merits and giving Absolutions, as you challenge?

Pop. *Our great Argument is*, John 20. 23. Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained. *Answer me this Argument, and I will yield up this Cause.*

Prot. What Argument do you draw from these words?

Pop. *Hence it appears that* Ministers *are made judges, and intrusted with full power and authority of binding and loosing*; *so as* Christ doth not loose (*or forgive*) a sinner by himself, but only by the Priest, *as* Bellarmin *saith.* (*a*) *And to speak properly, as our most learned* Vasquez *affirmeth*, God doth not properly loose a sinner, but only approves of the Priests loosing of him. (*b*)

(*a*) *De Penit. l.* 3. *c.* 3. (*b*) *In* 3. *partem Thomæ qu.* 84. *art.* 3.

Prot.

Prot. Now in my opinion, it were good manners to make the Priest come after God, and not to make God depend upon the Priest. It seems then, if the Priest, should grow surly or envious, and deny me a Pardon, Christ cannot help me, for he hath given the power out of his hands: So you make the Priest the Judge, and God only the Approver. The Lord rebuke this spirit of Blasphemy. Again, nothing is more familiar in Scripture than for Gods Ministers to be said to do that, which they do only authoritatively declare that God will do. Thus God saith to *Jeremy*, *I have set thee over Kingdoms to root out, and pull down, and destroy*, that is, by declaring that God would do it: In like manner Gods Ministers are said to bind and loose, because they have from God authority to declare a Sinner to be bound by his Sins, or loosed from them, which (if they declare truly and according to Gods word) God in heaven doth and will make it good. As for this Text, it saith nothing but this, that every one whom they bind or loose, that is, proceeding according to their rule, (which is alwayes to be understood) shall be bound or loosed in heaven; but it doth not say that no man is bound or loosed, but they whom

the Priest bindeth and looseth.

But besides, if all these things were granted, how doth this Text prove that the Priest or Pope can absolve or release any souls out of Purgatory, if there were such a place? I pray you tell me, can the Pope binde any soul and keep him in Purgatory?

Pop. *No, we do not pretend to that.*

Prot. Than he cannot loose a soul neither out of Purgatory; for I am sure binding and loosing are of the same extent. But upon second thoughts, I must own your discretion; for the binding of souls in Purgatory was an invidious and unprofitable work, and would have bound up mens hearts and purses: It is only the loosing of them out which opens their purse strings, & tends to the edification of the Church, that is, the Pope and Priests (as they alwayes understand that word.) In sober sadness, it is enough to make any serious Christian abhor your Church, that your Pope should not be content to usurp a power over the whole visible world, but that he should extend his Authority to the other world, even to Purgatory. In my opinion de had done more wisely to have extended his empire to Hell, for there are many of his Predecessors (so far as

can

can be judged by any mans life) whom he might have appointed his Deputies: but there is never a Pope in Purgatory; for they who can releaſe others at pleaſure, will certainly deliver themſelves: But now I ſpeak of that, I pray you tell me if it be true that I have heard, that the Pope when he dies, receives Abſolution from his Confeſſor, and that after his death the Cardinals give him Abſolution, and give order for the ſinging of abundance of Maſſes?

Pop. *It is true, I was at* Rome *when the laſt Pope died, and it was ſo then, and our Books juſtifie it.*

Prot. I am much pleaſed with your ingenuity, ſo the Pope gives the Prieſt a power to pardon himſelf; methinks he might ſave the charges of a Confeſſor; it were enough to ſay, *I abſolve my ſelf.* But tell me, do you ſay Maſſes for any that are in Heaven or in Hell.

Pop. *No, we utterly diſclaim that.*

Prot. Then I perceive the Pope goes into purgatory. I ſee your Popes are not ſelf-ſeeking men (as they are ſlandered to be) that help ſo many thouſands out of Purgatory, and leave themſelves in.

But really, this is to me a convincing Argument, that you do not believe your ſelves,

ſelves, but deceive poor ſilly people againſt your Conſciences. For elſe you might be aſſured the Pope would never come into Purgatory; for you ſay he can keep himſelf out, and no man doubts of his will to do it. Beſides, your Doctrine uſurps upon God's prerogative. I had thought it was only my Father in Heaven to whom I ſhould have prayed, *Forgive us our Treſpaſſes*: Now it ſeems we muſt pray ſo to one of theſe Padre's upon earth. You make Subjects the ſupream Judges of all Offences committed againſt their Soveraign, and your Prieſts ſit as Umpires between God and the Sinner, and determine what Satisfaction God ſhall have, and what Penance the Sinner ſhall undergo. Methinks they are brave fellows; and I now ſee it was not without ground that Father *Cotton* bragged, That *he could do any thing when he had his God in his hand,* (that was the Sacrament) *and his King upon his knees* (in Confeſſion.) I think you will bring Chriſt upon his knees too, for it ſeems you have reſolved, that he ſhall ſtand to your Prieſts Arbitration.

I might add to this, that you leave the ſouls of people to endleſs perplexities; you confeſs, that Indulgences profit not, *If a man be not in the ſtate of grace* (a)

(a) *Bell. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 13.* (which

(which you say a man cannot certainly know) or *if a man have not made a free and full Confession after sufficient examination* * (and who knows when he hath done these things sufficiently?) or *if the Priest do not intend to Pardon him* (and who knows another mans intentions?) and yet you would have me so desperate to venture my soul upon such sandy foundations, that your selves are afraid and ashamed of. But, to leave this, I perceive that this, and diverse of your other Doctrines are grounded upon that of the merit of good works, which because I judge a very pernicious and dangerous Doctrine; let me hear what you can say for it: but first, let me understand your Doctrine: for I have heard some of you cry out, that your Divines slandered them, and profess that they did not hold Merit strictly, but cast the honour of all upon Christ and the grace of God; therefore I pray you inform me.

Pop. *I will be plain and candid with you, I do not like such artifices*; *The Council of* Trent *in plain terms affirms, That* our good works do truly merit increase of grace and eternal life (*a*); *and our famous*

* *Council. Trident. de Pœnitentia.* (*a*) *Cap.* 11. *can.* 32.

Bel-

Bellarmine *disputes, and proves, That* good works do not only merit in respect of Gods gracious Covenant, but in regard of the worthiness of the works themselves *and* that eternal life is not only due from Gods liberality, but from his just judgment (*b*).

Prot. I pray you tell me, hath *Bellarmin* such expressions as these, That *because God would honour his children, he would have them to get Heaven by their merits, which is more honourable to them than to receive it by Gods free gift?*

Pop. Bellarmine *doth say so* (*c*)

Prot. I see he was a man of a brave spirit, and much a Gentleman: but in my poor opinion, he should have taken a little care for the honour of God as well as of the Saints. But I have heard of many other strange expressions ascribed to your Authors. I hear your *Tapperus* saith, *Far be it from them, that righteous men should expect eternal life as a beggar doth an alms. It is much more glorious that they should receive it as Conquerours and Triumphers, and possess it as a reward due to their labours* (*d*); I see also this was a man

(*b*) *De Justificat. l. 5. cap. 16. & 17.* (*c*) *De Justif. l. 5. c. 3,* (*d*) *In Explic. Artic. Lovan. Tom. 2. Art. 9.*

of

of honour: And again, That *our good works deſerve the reward from God as from a juſt Judge, and are able to abide the ſevere judgment of God, though he weigh all Circumſtances* (*c*). I am told that your renowned *Vaſquez* ſaith, That *Eternal life is due to the works of good men, without any Covenant, or the favour of God* (*d*). And your learned *Cajetan* and *Dominicus a Scoto* ſay as much as I hear *Bellarmine* reports (*e*). And that *Vaſquez* again ſaith, *The merits or Perſon of Chriſt adds no worth to the works of good men* (*f*). This man was reſolved ſo ~~far~~ to tread in *Abraham*'s ſteps; as *Abraham* would not receive from the King of *Sodom*, ſo he would not receive from Chriſt, from a thread to a ſhoe-latchet, leſt it ſhould be ſaid Chriſt had made him rich. Are theſe things true?

Pop. *It is ſo.*

Prot. Then ſure I am, our Religion is the ſafeſt way; If we do err, it is in giving too much to God; but if you err, it is no leſs than the worſt kind of ſacriledge to rob God of ſo much of his glory and the honour of your Salvation. Yet, if

(*c*) *Ibid. art.* 8. (*d*) *In* 1. *ſecundæ tom.* 2. *diſ.* 214. (*e*) *De Juſtif. l.* 5. *c.* 17. (*f*) *ubi ſupra.*

you

you can prove this, I will receive it. Produce your ſtrongeſt Arguments.

Pop. *Firſt then, I prove it hence, That* Eternal life is called a reward, *Mat.* 5. 12. *and given to Labourers in the Vineyard*, Mat. 20.

Prot. We muſt compare Scripture with Scripture: other places tell us, it is an Inheritance, *Gal.* 4. 7, *Rom.* 8. 17. The ſame Eſtate cannot be mine both by inheritance and purchaſe.

Pop. *Yes it may, I will prove it by an inſtance, The glory which Chriſt had was his by inheritance (for he was heir of all things) and yet by purchaſe*, Philip. 2. 8, 9.

Prot. I thank you for this objection: I have ſcarce had any thing from you like a ſolid Argument but this: It deſerves an Anſwer; Firſt then, this will not reach our caſe: The great inheritance of merit in our works is, that the beſt of them are imperfect, and a debt we owe to God before hand; but Chriſts works are of another kind, they are compleat and perfect, and in part no debt, for though when Chriſt was made Man, he was a debter to god, and bound as a creature to fulfill the Law, yet this was a voluntary act, and no debt to God, that he would become

become Man, and ſo put himſelf under the Law. Beſides, the dignity of his Perſon made his works proportionable unto all the glory he received; whereas *all our ſufferings are not worthy to be compared with our glory*, Rom. 8. 18. Secondly, It might be both an Inheritance and Purchaſe in Chriſt in divers reſpects; becauſe he had two natures; as he was God, or the Son of God, it was his Inheritance, and belonged to his Manhood only as united with the Godhead; as he was Man, he might purchaſe it, by what he did and ſuffered in the fleſh: But in us there are not two natures, nor any of theſe pretences to merit. Moreover Scripture ſpeaks of two kinds of Rewards, the one of Grace, the other of Debt, and withall affirms, that the reward which God gives to good men is meerly of grace, (as we profeſs) and not of debt (as you pretend) *Rom.* 4. 4.

Pop. *Poſſibly it may be of both, as* Bellarmin *ſaith**.

Prot. No, the Apoſtle forbids that, Rom, 11. 6. *If by grace, it is no more of works, otherwiſe grace is no more grace, but if it be of works, then it is no more grace,*

* *Lib.* 5. *cap.* 17.

other-

otherwiſe work is no more work, and this *reward is not given to him that worketh, but believeth*, Rom. 4. 5. No Proteſtant could ſpeak our Doctrine more fully.

Pop. *But God gives this reward to men for working in his Vineyard*, Mat. 20.

Prot. It is true; but ſtill the reward appears to be of grace, becauſe it is alike to him that came at the laſt hour, as to them that had born the heat and burden of the day, *verſ.* 12. but that Heaven is a reward of Juſtice, and a due debt, (as you profeſs) this Text proves not, and other Scriptures plainly contradict.

Pop. *But God is ſaid to reward men* according to their works, *that is according to the proportion of them, and that implies merit.*

Prot. Not ſo neither; for ſince *God is pleaſed to reward in us his own gifts and graces, not our merits*, as S. *Bernard* ſpeaks, he may ſtill keep the proportion, and to them to whom he gives more grace here, he may give more glory hereafter; and yet there is no more merit in this additional reward than in the reſt. Again, I may as well conclude, that the blind men merited their ſight, becauſe Chriſt ſaith, *Be it unto you according to your faith*, Mat. 9. 29. as you gather merit from this

this phraſe, *according to your work*; therefore let me hear if you have any other Argument.

Pop. *Our works are mentioned as the cauſes for which God gives eternal life*, *Mat.* 25. Come ye bleſſed, for I was hungry and you fed me, *and other like places.*

Prot. S. *Paul* did not think this a good Argument; for though he knew that it was ſaid of *Abraham*, *Becauſe thou haſt done this, I will bleſs thee*, *Gen.* 22. 16, 17. yet he poſitively denies the merit of *Abraham*'s works, *Rom.* 4. & *Gal.* 3. And he ſaith of himſelf, *I obtain mercy, becauſe I did it ignorantly*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. yet I hope you do not think his ignorance merited mercy: The King ſaith, *I forgive thee all that debt, becauſe thou deſiredſt me*, Mat. 18. 32. Did his asking deſerve it? Beſides all this, if God did reward them for their good works, this will not prove merit; if God reward men infinitely more than their good works deſerve (as God indeed doth) and *Bellarmine* acknowledgeth ſo much *.

Pop. *But good men are ſaid to be worthy*, Rev. 3. 4.

---

* *De Juſtif. lib.* 5. *cap.* 19.

Prot.

Prot. They are so comparatively to other men, and also by Gods gracious acception in and through Christ, but otherwise the holiest Saints of God have ever judged themselves unworthy of the least of Gods mercies (so far were they from thinking they were worthy of eternal life) *Gen.* 32. 10. *Mat.* 8. 8. And since it is Gods grace which gives them all their worth and meetness for Heaven, *Coloss.* 1. 12. it is impudence to pretend to merit from God by it. If yet you will boast of your own worth and merit, answer the Apostles question at your leasure, 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. *For who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?* If you can baffle your conscience now, you will find it an hard question to answer at the last day.

Pop. *But eternal life is given them by Gods justice*, 2 Thess. 4. 6. 1 Tim. 4. 7, 8.

Prot. This word also doth not prove any merit, for Gods Justice is oft-times taken improperly, I read 1 John 1. 9. *If we confess our sins he is just and faithful to forgive them*, yet justification is not merited as you confess, but is an act of meer

meer grace, *being justified freely by his grace*, &c. *Rom.* 3. 24, 28. thus, 2 *Pet.* 1. 1. we are said to *obtain precious faith through the righteousness of God*; and yet faith is the gift of God, and you confess that is given without merit (for you grant none but justified persons can merit) therefore, in such places, justice is taken either for equity and the congruity of it with Gods nature or word, or for the faithfulness of God, or the like.

Pop. *Since you despise my arguments, let me hear if you have better against the merit of good works.*

Prot. You shall, and methinks that one place, *Luke* 17. 10. shall convince you, *when ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say we are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do.*

Pop. *Christ doth not affirm they are unprofitable, but only bids them say they are unprofitable, and teaches them to be humble.* (a)

Prot. Very well: then you think Christ taught them to think one thing, and say another, that is, he taught them the art of lying, and that to God.

(a) *Bell. de Justif. l. 5. c. 5. sect. quart.*

Pop.

Pop. *I answer further, that without Gods grace men are unprofitable, they only can merit that are in the state of grace as our Church holds.*

Prot. Doth not your Conscience tell you the Apostles, whom Christ commands to say thus, were in the state of grace?

Pop. *Though a man cannot profit God, he may profit himself.*

Prot. If he cannot profit God, he cannot properly merit any thing from God, for that implies a proportion between giving and receiving.

Pop. *It is true we are unprofitable by our selves in regard of Gods absolute soveraignty, but not unprofitable in regard of Gods gracious Covenant.*

Prot. It is ridiculous to say that is merit properly which depends on Gods meer grace, and besides the Pharisees themselves, whose errour Christ there strikes at, were never so vain or absurd to think that they could be profitable to God in any other sense than what you affirm.

Pop. *Let me hear your other Argument.*

Prot. The nature of merit shews the impossibility of it in men: It is evident that to merit, these amongst other ingredients, are required. First,

First, that the work be not due already: doth any man deserve an estate for that money whereby he payes an old debt?

Secondly, That the work be our own; you do not think a noble mans Almoner merits by distributing his Masters Alms.

Thirdly, that it be profitable to him of whom he merits.

Fourthly, That the work be perfect; for that action which needs a pardon, certainly cannot deserve a reward.

Fifthly, That it be suitable to the reward; if I present my Prince with an horse, and he requites me with a Lordship, who but a horse would pretend this was merited?

Pop. *I must acknowledge most of these things are true, but this doth not concern our works.*

Prot. That we will now examine, and first all the works now we can do for God are deserved by him: It fills me with horrour to hear men pretending to merit of that God, who (as they profess) created them, and every day upholds their souls in life, and redeemed them, and is so infinitely before hand with them every way; Tell me, dare you say that God doth

no

not deſerve that you ſhould do the utmoſt you can for his ſervice and glory?

Pop. *I will not ſay ſo.*

Prot. Then it is impudence to pretend merit from God; beſides, the good works we do, are not properly our own, but Gods; *Faith is the gift of God*, Epheſ. 2.8. Phil. 1. 29. *So is Repentance*, Acts 11, 18. & 5. 31. and in general, *every good and perfect gift is from God*, Jam. 1. 17.

Pop. *The firſt grace is from God, but that I uſe it aright, that is from my ſelf, and thereby it is that I merit.*

Prot. St. *Paul* was not of your mind; what good work is there but it lies either in willing or doing? yet both theſe *God works in us*, Phil. 2. 13. not only the power of believing, but the act too, (and ſuffering alſo) is *the gift of God*, *Phil.* 1. 29. and St. *Pauls* abundant labours in the Goſpel, which certainly amounted to merit, if there were ever ſuch a thing in the world, and which, if any thing, was his own act, yet he dare not take to himſelf, *I laboured, yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me*, 1 Cor. 15. 10. No leſs evident is it, that our works cannot profit God, *Pſal.* 16. 4. *Job* 22. 3. & 35. 7. as alſo our beſt works are ſo farr

far from meriting that they need a pardon for the infirmities accompanying them, by reaſon of which the beſt of Saints have been afraid of the ſevere judgment of God even upon their beſt works; ſo was *Job* (*a*) and *David* (*b*) and *Paul* (*c*) And laſtly, it is ſo evident that our works are not proportionable to the reward, that *Bellarmin* hath a Chapter upon this head, to prove that *good works are rewarded above their deſert*; (*d*) and therefore it is an intolerable arrogance to affirm, that divers of the Saints have not only merit enough to purchaſe eternal life, but a great deal to ſpare for the relief of others.

To let this point paſs, now I would willingly be informed of two things which concern us Lay-people in an eſpecial manner;

Firſt, Why you defraud us of the Cup.

Secondly, Why you order Prayer to be made in a language that many, nay, moſt of us do not underſtand: For the firſt, you rob us of one half of the Sacra-

---

(*a*) *Job* 9.2. (*b*) *Pſal.* 130, 2. (*c*) 1 *Cor.*4.4. (*d*) *De Juſtif. l.* 1. *c.* 19.

ment: *viz.* of the Cup; what can you ſay to acquit your ſelves from ſacriledge?

Pop. *Let me hear what right you have to it.*

Prot. Firſt, I remember you diſputed for Tranſubſtantiation out of *John* 6. which, you ſaid, ſpoke of the Sacrament; now if you ſay true, there is a paſſage in it, verſe 53, *except you eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you*; if this be ſpoken of the Sacrament (as you ſay it is) and the wine be really his blood, then you do no leſs than murder all your people, by robbing them of that which is neceſſary to their life.

Pop. *Not ſo, (for as I ſhall ſhew you) you have the blood in the body (or bread.)*

Prot. If it be ſo, yet my taking it in that manner cannot be called a drinking it, unleſs you will ſay that every man that eats rawiſh meat may be ſaid to drink the blood which he eats in it; but further, I think we have as great right to the cup as your Prieſts, we have Chriſts *do this*, and you pretend no more; in ſhort, we have both the legacy and command of Chriſt fortified with this ſtrong reaſon, *this cup is the new Teſtament in my blood which is*

ſhed

shed for many for the remission of sins; whereby it sufficiently appears, that the signe belongs to all that have interest in the thing, and are capable of discerning the Lords body; and this command of Christ is express and positive, *Mat. 26. Drink ye A L L of it*, it is remarkable that he doth not say, eat ye *all* (though they were to do so) but drink ye *all* of it, as foreseeing the sacriledge of your Church; what can you say to this?

Pop. *First I say here is no command but an institution only.*

Prot. I understand no subtilties; but if you say, this was no command of drinking, then it was no command of eating, to say, *take*, *eat*, and so the Sacrament is not commanded: but people may receive or refuse it as they please, and Christs *do this* is no more than *do as you list*; for my part I shall never know when Christ commands any thing, if this be not a command, for no command can run in more express words.

Pop. *If this be a command, it concerns only* Priests, *for such the Apostles were, and they only were present.*

Prot. Since it is evident, that eating and drinking belong to the same persons, if the one be restrained to the Apostles;

ſo is the other, and becauſe you confeſs the eating belongs to the people by vertue of this precept [*Eat of it*] by the ſame reaſon alſo doth the drinking reach to them alſo by vertue of that precept, [*Drink of it.*] Beſides the Apoſtles though they were *Miniſters*, yet in this act they were in *the peoples* ſtead, and Chriſt was the *Miniſter* or diſpenſer of the Sacrament, and they only the *receivers* of it at this *time*.

Beſides, as they were *Miniſters* he bad them *do this*, that is, take and diſtribute bread and wine to the people as he had to them; If *Miniſters* be under any command of adminiſtring and giving the Sacrament, certainly it is here (for no command can be more expreſs) and if they are commanded to give the bread to the people, they are commanded to give the wine alſo, for here is no difference at all.

Adde to this that S. *Paul* hath put this out of doubt, and he expounds this of, and applies it to the people, for thus he writes to all the Corinthians, *Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread and drink of that Cup*, 1 Cor. 11. 28. in four verſes together, *viz.* 26, 27, 28, 29. eating and drinking are inſepa-

rably

rably joyned together, which you have ſo wickedly divided: If it be a Command, *Let a man examine himſelf*, (which none will deny) then it is a Command (which immediately follows) *ſo let him eat this Bread, and drink this Cup.*

Pop. *It doth not appear that there is an abſolute command of drinking, but only that as oft as they do drink it, they ſhould drink it in remembrance of Chriſt.*

Prot. If this be ſo, then here is no command for the Prieſt either to Conſecrate the Cup, or to Receive it. And further, then here is no command for his Conſecrating or Receiving the Bread neither; for there is no more than a *Do this*, and that is for the Wine as well as for the Bread.

Pop. *Here is a difference, for he ſaith of the Body ſimply*, Do this in remembrance of me; *but of the Cup*, This do ye as oft as you drink it.

Prot. If you lay any ſtreſs upon theſe words, *as oft as you do it*, I beſeech you make uſe of your eyes, and you ſhall read that is is ſaid of the Bread as well as of the Cup, Verſ. 26. *For as oft as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup.* Well, I am ſorry to ſee that you dare oppoſe ſuch plain Scripture upon

ſuch pitiful pretences. But I pray you let me ask you, I have been told that your famous Council of *Conſtance*, in their Canon, for the receiving the Sacrament in one kind, have theſe expreſſions; *Although Chriſt did Miniſter this Sacrament under the forms of Bread and Wine — And although in the Primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds*—Yet they make a Canon that it ſhall be received under one kind only. Is this ſo?

Pop. *It is true; they are the very words of the Council.*

Prot. This was a wiſe Council indeed, wiſer than Chriſt and all his Apoſtles; but I ſhould think we are on the ſafeſt ſide, having Chriſt and all the Primitive Churches for our patterns; and by this I ſee what to judge of your glorious pretences, that yours is the Antient and Apoſtolical Faith, and ours (forſooth) but a new Religion. But I pray let me hear what you have to ſay for this fact of yours in taking away the Cup? I ſee Scripture is againſt you, and the Antient Church, at leaſt ſo far that for 1400. years together the people might drink of the Cup, (if they would) as I am told your *Becanus* confeſſeth *.

* *In manuali de communione ſub utraque ſpecie.*

Pop.

Pop. *You are greatly miſtaken, we have Scripture for us, we have examples there of receiving the Sacrament in one kind, Acts* 2. 42. They continued in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and breaking of Bread; and *Acts* 20. 17. They came together to break Bread.

Prot. It is uſual to expreſs an whole Feaſt by this one thing, *Chriſt went into the Phariſees houſe to eat bread*, Luk. 14. 2. I ſuppoſe, you think it was not a dry feaſt; *Joſeph's* Brethren *ſat to eat*, Gen. 37. 25. ſo Act. 27. 35. *Paul* (and the reſt) *took bread and eat it*, yet none doubts but they had drink with it. Beſides, here is as much ſaid of the *People* as of the *Miniſters* drinking of the Cup, that is, neither is here mentioned; and if the ſilence concerning the Cup be a good Argument, it proves that neither did partake of it: if it be not, then both might partake of it: But what have you more to ſay?

Pop. *You need not be troubled ſo much at the loſs of the Cup, ſince the blood is contained in the Bread, that is, in the Body, by concomitancy.*

Prot. This is in effect to tell Chriſt the Cup was a ſuperfluous device: Beſides, we are commanded to drink the

Cup: If I ſhould dip bread in drink and eat it, no man will ſay I drink the bread. Again, this deſtroys the main end of the Sacrament, which is to ſhew forth Chriſts death, and the ſhedding of his blood; and this was the reaſon why Chriſt appointed the Bread and Wine apart, as the fitteſt means to bring to our memories the pouring of his blood out of his body for us; and as God would have us to remember the thing, ſo he commanded us to uſe this ſign of drinking the Cup.

Pop. *But there are many weighty reaſons why it is not fit you ſhould partake of the Cup.*

Prot. I dare not forſake plain Scripture for any ſubtil pretences of Humane Reaſon; but let me hear them.

Pop. 1. *In ſome Countries Wine is not to be had.* 2. *Some there are who have an antipathy againſt Wine, and cannot drink any.* 3. *There is great danger of ſpilling the Wine, which is the Blood of Chriſt.*

Prot. Are theſe your weighty Reaſons; I ſee the Reaſon and Religion of *Rome* are both of a Complexion. But I pray you how came it to paſs, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and all the Primitive Chriſtians for ſo many hundreds of

of years ſhould preſcribe and uſe the Cup, notwithſtanding thoſe reaſons? ſurely if theſe reaſons are ſtrong now, they were ſo 1600. years ago: Wine was as ſcarce then (as now it is) in ſome Countries; abſtemious perſons were then as well as now; the Wine might be ſpilled then as much as now. But they feared none of theſe things; either they were all ſtupid that did not ſee theſe things, or your Church is audacious, that dare in effect teach Chriſt and his Apoſtles, what they ſhould have done. It might peradventure be added, that in ſuch places where Wine cannot be had, or for ſome perſons who cannot drink Wine, ſome other thing proportionable to it may be allowed; but if it might not, or if in ſuch ſpecial caſes they were confined to one kind, I am ſure it is a ridiculous conſequence, that becauſe they muſt be content with the Bread that cannot drink of the Cup, therefore they that can, ſhall go without it; and becauſe it may be omitted where it cannot be had, therefore it ſhall be omitted where it may be enjoyed. And for the danger of ſpilling of the Wine, there is alſo danger in dropping ſome of the Bread, and ſo that ſhould be denied:

By

By this Argument alſo the Prieſt ſhould not meddle with the Wine, for he may ſpill it; but indeed ſuch phantaſtical Reaſons as theſe deſerve no Anſwer; they make me almoſt ſick to hear them.

There is only one Point more, I would be informed in, what you can pretend for it, and that is, That your Publick Prayers are performed in a Language unknown to moſt of your people.

Pop. *What have you to ſay againſt it?*

Prot. What can be ſaid more plainly and fully againſt it by us, than what S. *Paul* ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 14. there I find ſome, who having the Gift of ſpeaking with divers Languages, did uſe it without interpreting them in the Publick Aſſembly; thoſe the Apoſtle informs, that there is a better gift and more deſirable than that of Tongues, namely Propheſie, and he uſeth divers reaſons, which are ſo many undeniable Arguments againſt your *Latine* Prayers: He tells them it is their duty to manage Publick Worſhip, ſo as the Church may be edified, *verſ.* 4, 5, 12. I hope you will not deny this.

Pop. *None can deny that.*

Prot. Well; then he tells us that what is ſpoken in an unknown Language doth not

not edifie the Church, *verſ.* 4, 11, 12, 14. 2. Yet again, the Apoſtle commands that if any do ſpeak in an unknown Tongue it muſt be interpreted, *verſ.* 27. you diſobey this command. 3. He argues that Publick Prayers are ſo to be made by the Miniſter that the People may ſay *Amen*, *v.* 16. And he alſo tells us that no man can ſay *Amen* to that which he doth not underſtand, *verſ.* 15. ſo the Apoſtle ſtops all your ſtarting holes.

Pop. *The very word* Amen *is* Hebrew.

Prot. You diſpute not only againſt me, but againſt the Apoſtle himſelf; but *Amen*, though an *Hebrew* word, is by common uſe ſufficiently known to us all to expreſs our conſent to his Prayers, and confidence that God will hear them. 4. Yet again, he argues that ſtrange Tongues are deſigned only for the Conviction of Unbelievers not to be uſed by Believers amongſt themſelves, unleſs interpreted, *v.* 22. What can, or dare you ſay againſt ſuch clear places?

Pop. *S.* Paul *ſpeaks not of the ordinary ſervice of the Church, but of extraordinary Hymnes and Songs.*

Prot. That is falſe; he ſpeaks of the ordinary ſervice of the Church, though at that time there was ſomething extraor-

traordinary in it; and beſides, his reaſons reach to all times and ſervices, ordinary or extraordinary; muſt we not look to the Edification of the Church in the one as well as the other? Muſt not the people ſay *Amen* in one as well as the other? Let me hear therefore what you have to ſay for your ſelves.

Pop. *Preaching ought to be in a known language; for the end of that is the peoples edification, but Prayers are made to God.*

Prot. Though they are made to God, yet they are made by the Church, who are to joyn in thoſe prayers, and to ſignifie their Conſent by ſaying *Amen*, which requires their underſtanding: And moreover, that Chapter ſpeaks as expreſly of *Praying* as it doth of *Propheſying* in the Church. Surely the people went not to Church to ſit there like ſenſeleſs Images, but to offer up a reaſonable ſervice, and to tender their *Prayers* and *Praiſes* unto God by the mouth of the Miniſter, as they did, *Act.* 4. 24. *They lift up their voice with one accord.* And if we pray with you, we muſt underſtand; elſe we cannot pray in faith (as it is our duty to do) and we ſhall fall into their error to ask we know not what.

Pop.

Pop. *You need not concern your ſelf about that; you may rely upon the wiſdom and fidelity of the Church, who takes care that your prayers be right.*

Prot. I confeſs there is this great encouragement for it, that your Church, it ſeems, is wiſer than S. *Paul*: but as a friend I adviſe you to give this Counſel of relying upon your Church to the *Indians*, or ſome remote places, for they that know her will never truſt her. For my part, my Saviours words make me cautious, *If the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the ditch.* If I had no other argument of your Churches Fallibility and Apoſtacy; this one point were a ſufficient evidence of them both. But what have you more to ſay?

Pop. *I will give you then a Scripture inſtance; The Prieſts prayed in the Temple when the people waited without*, Luke 1. 21.

Prot. What is this to the purpoſe? I do not read, that the Prieſt prayed at all, but only went in to offer Incenſe; but if he did pray, he did it alone, not with and before the people, as your prayers are; you might as well plead thus, Thoſe Prieſts ſaid nothing at all, and therefore your Prieſts need only make a dumb ſhew, and may

may ſerve their (*Latin* as well as their Engliſh) which may be good counſel for many of them that have ſo little to ſpare.

But ſeriouſly can you, or any rational man think, theſe reaſons of ſufficient weight to oppoſe againſt that great Scripture rule of Edification, and the expreſs words and plain arguments of S. *Paul*; God deliver me from ſuch a beſotting Religion.

Beſides what I have ſaid, I ſhall leave this with you at parting, That you do not only oppoſe Scripture, but alſo that Antient Church which you pretend to reverence, and to follow her ſteps, and your practice is contrary to the Church in all antient times.

The *Prayers* of the *Jews* in publick, were alwayes made in the *Hebrew* tongue, and in that tongue God gave them thoſe forms of Prayer and bleſſing which were then uſed, *Numb.* 6. 10.

God gave the gift of Languages to that end, that the Apoſtles might eſtabliſh the Worſhip of God in every Nation in their own Language: And I am told, that *Origen* reports this to be the practice of the Church in his time (as well as his own Judgment) That *every one did pray to God in his own dialect, Greeks in Greek, and Latines*

times in Latin, &c. (*a*) Besides, I am told, that your own Authors, *Lyra*, *Aquinas*, and *Harding*, and others confess, this was the practice of the antient Church, and that one of your own Councils, that of *Lateran* in the year 1215. did make this order, that *Whereas in many places there were mixed people of divers Languages and customs, the Bishops should take care to provide fit men that should perform divine Service, amongst them, according to this difference of Rites and Languages.* (*b*) Moreover, that your great Cardinal *Cajetan* confesseth, that *Prayers ought to be in a known tongue.* (*c*) Are these things so?

(*a*) Ὁι λοιποὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν οὐδὲ τοῖς ἐν ταῖς θείαις γράφαις κειμένοις ὀνόμασι —— χρῶνται ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς, ἀλλ' ὁι μὲν Ἕλληνες Ἑλληνικοῖς, ὁι δ' Ρωμαῖοι Ρωμαϊκοῖς, καὶ οὕτως ἕκαστος κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διάλεκτον εὔχεται τῷ θεῷ καὶ ὁ πάσης διαλέκτου κύριος τῶν ἀπὸ πάσης διαλέκτου εὐχομένων ἀκούει. Orig. *contra celsum. lib.* 8.

(*b*) *Quoniam in plerisque partibus intra eandem civitatem & diœcesin permixti sunt populi diversarum linguarum, habentes sub una fide varios ritus & mores, districtè præcipimus ut Pontifices hujusmodi civitatum provideant viros idoneos qui secundum diversitatem rituum & linguarum divina officia illis celebrent,* c. 9.

(*c*) *Ex hac Pauli doctrinâ habetur quod melius ad ædificationem Ecclesiæ est orationes publicas quæ audiente populo dicuntur, dici linguâ communi clericis & populo, quàm dici Latinè.* Cajet. *in* 1 Cor. 14.

Pop.

Pop. *I cannot deny it. Their Books are extant.*

Prot. Then by this, I see, how far your Church is not only from Infallibility, but from common honesty, that dare pretend they hold nothing but what hath been by constant Tradition conveyed to them from the Apostles times until this day. And by this I shall judge of all your other brags of Antiquity in your Doctrine. So I see you are obstinate and incorrigible, and therefore I shall trouble my self no further to talk with you.

FINIS.

Pop. *I cannot deny it. Their Books are extant.*

Prot. Then by this, I see, how far your Church is not only from Infallibility, but from common honesty, that dare pretend they hold nothing but what hath been by constant Tradition conveyed to them from the Apostles times until this day. And by this I shall judge of all your other brags of Antiquity in your Doctrine. So I see you are obstinate and incorrigible, and therefore I shall trouble my self no further to talk with you.

FINIS.